

JAIMINĪYA BRĀHMAṆA I, 1-65

TRANSLATION AND COMMENTARY

WITH A STUDY

AGNIHOTRA AND PRĀṆĀGNIHOTRA

PROEFSCHRIFT

TER VERKRIJGING VAN DE GRAAD VAN
DOCTOR IN DE LETTEREN

AAN DE RIJKSUNIVERSITEIT TE UTRECHT,

OP GEZAG VAN DE RECTOR MAGNIFICUS

PROF. DR. S.J. GROENMAN,

VOLGENS BESLUIT VAN HET COLLEGE VAN DEKANEN

IN HET OPENBAAR TE VERDEDIGEN

OP VRIJDAG 12 JANUARI 1973 DES NAMIDDAGS TE 3.15 UUR

DOOR

HENDRIK WILHELM BODEWITZ

geboren op 13 oktober 1939 te Gramsbergen



LEIDEN

E. J. BRILL

1973

PROMOTOR:
PROF. DR. J. GONDA

Published with financial support from the Netherlands
Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.)

Dit proefschrift verschijnt in „Orientalia Rheno-Traiectina”, deel XVII.

VOOR JANNEKE

STELLINGEN

I

Een onbeperkt vertrouwen in de puur-filologische interpretatie van de Vedische godsdienst is misplaatst. Het valt toe te juichen, dat in de Indologie de filologie haar te overheersende, negentiende-eeuwse positie verloren heeft. Toch moet bij het huidige streven naar zogenaamd "grensverleggend" onderzoek (vooral in de eenzijdig-schematische, sociologiserende benadering van de Veda) het "grenzenmarkerende" aspekt, dat vertegenwoordigd wordt door de filologie, niet verwaarloosd worden.

II

De hypothese van Schrapel betreffende de sigla *gha* en *ga* in het kritisch apparaat van Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa II wordt bij een zorgvuldig onderzoek van de lezingen niet in alle gevallen bevestigd. Dit zou de onjuistheid van de hypothese moeten impliceren, ware het niet, dat aangaande de zorgvuldigheid van de editie en de notatie van de lezingen twijfel gerechtvaardigd is. In elk geval is het onaanvaardbaar, dat decennia na het verschijnen van een zich kritisch noemende editie nog steeds naar herkomst en betekenis van handschriften geraden moet worden.

D. Schrapel, *Untersuchung der Partikel iva* (dissertatie Marburg 1970), p. XIII.

III

Renou's vertaling van *ā vavytsva* "tourne-toi de notre côté" in R̥gveda Saṃhitā 3, 61, 3 is onjuist en houdt te weinig rekening met de specifieke kenmerken van Uṣas (Dageraad).

L. Renou, *Études Védiques et Pāṇiniennes* 3 (Parijs 1957), p. 67.

IV

De betekenis van *vicchinna*, gebruikt in verband met offers, is niet "useless" of "cut off (from its recipient)".

J. Eggeling, *Sacred Books of the East* 12 (1882), vertaling van Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 2, 3, 1, 9.

V

a) In Vādhūla Sūtra 3, 19 betekent *agnimukhāḥ* .. *prajāḥ* niet “die Geschöpfe, die Agni zum Munde haben”.

W. Caland, *Acta Orientalia* 4, p. 19 f.

b) In dezelfde passage kan Caland's vertaling van *tāny ulapāny abhavaṃs tāny ādravann ādatta tasmād yatraivātapaty ulapakakṣaṃ dahaty ādravann evainad ādatte* verbeterd worden door uit te gaan van het beeld van een “lopend” vuur, dat zich “etend” verspreidt in licht ontvlambaar materiaal zoals Ulapa gras.

c) Dan wordt ook de rest van de context duidelijker en betekent *sā ha vā eṣā devatā tad virataivāpy adya vanaspatiṣu* niet “diese Gottheit (nämlich Agni) ist ja auch heute in den Bäumen zur Ruhe gekommen (d.h. er ist latent im Holze anwesend)” (Caland).

VI

a) Bollée's vertaling “they practised austerities” geeft niet de juiste betekenis weer van *abhyatapan* (ŚaḍvB. 4, 1, 2), dat onderscheiden moet worden van *tapa* 'tapyanta' aan het begin van de passage.

W. B. Bollée, *Śaḍviṃśa Brāhmaṇa* (Utrecht 1956), p. 92.

b) In dezelfde passage slaat *teṣāṃ tapyamānām* derhalve niet op de goden (“from them, practising austerities”).

c) In ŚaḍvB. 4, 2 is *ṣoḍaśin* niet “the sixteen-day rite”, maar behoort samen met *ukthya* en *agniṣṭoma* tot de *ekāhas*.

VII

Aan het begin van composita heeft *deva-* (“van de goden, goddelijk”) soms de functie van een element dat een metafoor introduceert (*deva-ratha*, °-*cakra*, °-*kośa*, °-*mithuna*, °-*iṣu*, °-*pātra*, etc.) zonder dat er altijd een direct verband met goden of zelfs makrokosmische begrippen (*adhīdevam*) aantoonbaar is. Ook in de kosmogonie van Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa 3, 361, waar het mythische en onreële van een prekosmische tijdsrekening beklemtoond wordt, heeft *deva-* in *devasamvatsara-* nauwelijks enig verband met goden.

VIII

In Buddhacarita 14, 26 kan Johnston's lezing *prāpya caiveta-retaraiḥ*, waaraan hij zelf twijfelt, gehandhaafd worden, niet echter zijn vertaling, die geen rekening houdt met *ca*.

E. H. Johnston, *The Buddhacarita*, I: *Sanskrit Text* (Calcutta 1935), p. 160; II: *Cantos I to XIV translated* (Calcutta 1936), p. 206.

IX

In uitdrukkingen zoals *idam idam iti* (Buddhacarita 1, 88; vergelijk ook Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa 1, 3 *ayāṁ ayāṁ iti*) geeft *iti* niet het einde van een citaat aan.

X

a) In *sa yadaiva sarvābhi stuyur, athottamām agre brūyād athāvarām athāvarām* (JB. 1, 87) is de bijzin niet conditioneel, maar dient *yadā* met de optativus geïnterpreteerd te worden als “zodra (nadat)” + verleden tijd. De lezing *sadaiva* van de kritische editie (Nagpur 1954) geeft geen enkele zin.

W. Caland, *Das Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl*, Amsterdam 1919, p. 18.

b) Lees in JB. 2, 83 in plaats van *nyūnān na kṣarati* (zo ook de kritische editie) *nyūnān nikṣarati*.

Caland, o.c., p. 145.

c) Noch etymologisch, noch contextueel is de interpretatie van *dvidat* “der die Zähne gewechselt hat” aannemelijk in JB. 2, 83 *yathā dvidataḥ kumārasya sātām syād*. De *kumāra* is (evenals in JB. 1, 1) een baby.

Caland, o.c., p. 146 f.

d) Caland's lezing *yavakriyam* in plaats van *yavakriyam* (accusativus singularis) in JB. 2, 270 is onjuist, maar door een lacune in zijn handschriften wel begrijpelijk. Vreemd is echter dat de kritische editie *yavakriyam* blijft lezen (en zelfs niet een varia lectio *yavakriyam*, vermeld in Caland's noten, opneemt).

Caland, o.c., p. 190.

e) In het vers *jyāyo vā hi kanīyo vā na hi vā tena tat samam, kapālam anyathā saty acchidra upadhīyate* (JB. 2, 395) is de *kapāla* niet een schotel, maar een deksel.

Caland, o.c., p. 211 en 213.

XI

Dumont's opmerking "Je pense que *ni-kam-* signifie 'désirer conquérir', 'désirer vaincre', et aussi 'désirer surpasser', 'désirer soumettre', 'désirer l'emporter sur'" (naar aanleiding van TB. 1, 4, 4, 1) geeft blijk van een ongegrond vertrouwen in de wisselvallige commentaar van Sāyaṇa, die in een identieke context (TB. 1, 1, 5, 6) een totaal andere (en betere) interpretatie verschaft. Nog steeds blijft Caland's vertaling "wollte . . . für sich allein behalten" (met de opmerking "Diese Bedeutung von *nikāmayate* ist überall zutreffend") toepasbaar, ook in TB. 1, 4, 4, 1.

P.-É. Dumont, "Taittirīya-Brāhmaṇa 1.4.3.-4", *Mélanges d'Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou*, (Parijs 1968), p. 247, n. 1; W. Caland, *Altindische Zauberei* (Amsterdam 1908; Wiesbaden 1968), p. 25 (n. 90).

H. W. BODEWITZ

CONTENTS

Voorwoord	XI
Abbreviations of texts	XIII
Abbreviations of journals, series, etc.	XVIII

Introduction	I
------------------------	---

JAIMINĪYA BRĀHMAṆA, I, 1-65

1- 2. Agnyādhāna, agnihotra and cremation	19
3- 4. The agnihotra a reduced great sacrifice. Equation of the agnihotra with soma sacrifices.	24
5- 6. The right time for the performance of the agnihotra	29
7- 8. Interpretation of the agnihotra. The sun, which at the end of the day sixfoldly spreads, is reintegrated and generated by the agnihotrin	35
9-10. The agnihotra frees the performer from evil.	38
11. The agnihotrin is taken to heaven by the rising sun and released from death	42
12-14. Agni (= Death) is conquered by means of liquid oblations such as milk and especially soma.	45
15-16. The discrimination of the good and bad deeds and the deliverance from the results of the bad deeds by means of the two agnihotra oblations.	50
17-18. Man has a human and a divine <i>yonī</i> and <i>ātman</i> . By sacrificing in the āhavanīya one produces a second <i>ātman</i> in heaven, in the sun, with which one is united after death, if one has the required knowledge of the self	52
19-20. Discussion between Janaka and Yājñavalkya on the substitutes for the normal oblation. Truth is offered in <i>śraddhā</i> . The mental performance and the offering in the <i>prāṇa</i> during the <i>pravāsa</i>	62
21. The seventeenfold vaiśvadeva-agnihotra. The <i>sthānu</i> in the agnihotra	66
22-25. Discussion between Janaka and five brahmins on the agnihotra. The sun (= <i>yaśas</i> , <i>satyam</i> . . <i>gati</i>) is offered in the fire (= <i>yaśas</i> , <i>satyam</i> . . <i>iti</i>) and conversely.	72

26-38. The agnihotra of twelve days performed after the agnyādhāna	80
39-41. Systematic treatment and interpretation of the agnihotra ritual from the beginning to the end.	92
42-44. The story of Bhṛgu	99
45-46. (first half) and 49 (second half)-50. The doctrine of the five fires. Eschatology	110
46. (end)-49 (first half). The funeral rites.	124
51-65. Expiations	150
51-52. Vehicles or animals pass between the fires.	152
53-54. The milk is spilt	159
55-56. Something impure or rain falls on the milk	171
56. (last paragraph). The fire of the coals goes out after the first oblation has been offered.	178
57. The death of the agnihotrin during the rite.	180
58-59. The cow sits down while being milked	182
60. The calf of the agnihotra cow is lost. The cow milks blood	188
61. The extinction of the fires	192
62-63. The sun sets or rises over the āhavaniya, when it has not been taken out	201
64-65. The fires are mingled. One takes out fire to an āhavaniya which is still burning	206

AGNIHOTRA AND PRĀṆĀGNIHOTRA

I. Introduction	213
II. General qualifications of the agnihotra for the development of a simplified or symbolic substitute.	215
III. The prāṇāḥ and the agnihotra	220
IV. The agnihotra oblation	230
V. The symbolism of the agnihotra.	235
A. Adhidaivam	235
B. Adhyātmam	235
C. Combination of the adhidaivam and adhyātmam agnihotra.	240
VI. The "productive" and the "conservative" agnihotra	243
A. The eating of food regarded as an agnihotra	243
B. The water doctrine	243
C. The water doctrine and the agnihotra.	245

D. The pañcāgnividyā (ChU. 5, 3, 4 ff.; BĀU. 6, 2, 9 ff.) and KauṣU. 1, 2	249
VII. The prāṇāgnihotra ritual.	254
VIII. The bhojanam in the śrāddha ritual and its relation to the prāṇāgnihotra	259
IX. Upaniṣadic passages which rightly or wrongly have been connected with the prāṇāgnihotra	265
A. The antaram agnihotram of ŚāṅkhĀ. 10 and parallels	265
B. The contest of the prāṇāḥ (ChU. 5, 1-2; BĀU. 6, 1)	269
C. The ceremony of the mixed potion (mantha): ChU. 5, 2, 4 ff. and BĀU. 6, 3, and its relation to the contest of the prāṇāḥ	273
D. MaiU. and the prāṇāgnihotra	275
X. The performers of the prāṇāgnihotra in the texts discussed.	293
XI. The prāṇāgnihotra in later times	310
XII. Summary and conclusion	318

APPENDIX

The prāṇāgnihotra according to the Prapañcasāravivarāṇa, the commentary on the Prapañcasāratānta, ascribed to Padmapāda.	339
Concise Bibliography	344
General Index	348
Index of Sanskrit terms.	351
Index of Sanskrit Text-Places	355

VOORWOORD

Een tweevoudig doel lag ten grondslag aan deze dissertatie: een vertaling met commentaar van een gedeelte van het Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa (I, 1-65) en een studie van de betekenis van het agnihotra offer dat de hoofdinhoud vormt van genoemde sekte uit het brāhmaṇa. Het tweede doel bleek slechts perspectieven te bieden met betrekking tot één aspect van het agnihotra, namelijk zijn ontwikkeling tot een substituut in de vorm van het prāṇāgnihotra. Dit verklaart de op het eerste gezicht nogal losse relatie tussen het eerste en tweede gedeelte van dit werk. Er bestaan, echter, diverse verbindingen tussen de twee componenten, doordat het agnihotra zoals beschreven in het Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa veelvuldige aspecten vertoont die van belang zijn voor de beoordeling van de ontwikkeling van het prāṇāgnihotra.

Het voorwoord van een proefschrift betekent soms een nawoord bij een levensperiode. Zeker indien behalve de (tegenwoordig veelal langdurige) voorbereiding van de dissertatie ook de totale studietijd wordt overzien, die hier traditioneel zijn afsluiting vindt. In dit kader zou ik een woord van oprechte dank willen richten tot mijn familie, speciaal mijn broer en mijn zuster, die te vroeg geroepen werden om de rol van mijn ouders over te nemen en, ieder op eigen wijze, niets nagelaten hebben om een academische loopbaan mogelijk te maken.

De filologische scholing die ik in de sekte der Klassieke Letteren te Utrecht ontvangen heb, met name betreffende het Grieks, heeft in de voorbereiding van deze dissertatie herhaaldelijk een nuttige functie gehad.

Bijzondere dank ben ik verschuldigd aan mijn leermeester en promotor, professor Gonda, wiens belangstelling en steun ik reeds vóór mijn definitieve keuze voor het Sanskrit mocht verkrijgen en niet meer verloren heb, ook niet na mijn overgang naar een andere universiteit. Een blik op de eerste gecorrigeerde bladzijden van het manuscript en op de uiteindelijke versie van jaren later leert mij snel dat deze dissertatie een intensieve begeleiding heeft vereist. Mijn dank is blijvend.

Onder degenen die door referenties, gesprekken, adviezen en andere nuttige hulp aan dit werk hebben bijgedragen noem ik hier speciaal Dr. T. Vetter en Drs. L. A. van Daalen (Utrecht), Prof. Dr.

J. C. Heesterman (Leiden), Prof. Dr. Lokesh Chandra (New Delhi) en Dr. P. M. M. Geurts (Universiteits Bibliotheek Utrecht).

I am deeply indebted to Dr. Asko Parpola (Helsinki/Copenhagen) for having given very useful advices on the method of the work together with extensive bibliographical data and indexes of agnihotra passages, which were a great help at the beginning.

Ik zou verder dank willen brengen aan Z.W.O. voor de financiële ondersteuning van de publikatie, aan het Ministerie voor Onderwijs en Wetenschappen, dat de korrektie van het Engelse taalgebruik heeft betaald, en aan de uitgever voor de snelle afwikkeling van de publikatie.

Tenslotte is het mij een genoegen om mijn vrouw niet alleen als levenspartner in de niet altijd eenvoudige periode voor de voltooiing van een proefschrift, maar ook als partner in de Indologie mijn dank voor haar steun te betuigen. Zij corrigeerde soms te gewaagde emendaties, conjecturen en interpretaties, maar ook al de drukproeven. Aan haar draag ik dit boek op.

ABBREVIATIONS

Texts

- AĀ. Aitareyāranyaka; ed. & tr. A. B. Keith (*Anecd. Oxon.*, A.S. 9), 1909; ed. (with Sāyaṇa comm.) *Ān. S.G.* 38, 1959⁸.
 AB. Aitareyabrāhmaṇa; ed. Th. Aufrecht, Bonn 1879; tr. A. B. Keith in *Rigveda Brahmanas* (H.O.S. 25), 1920.
 ĀgnGS. Āgniveśyagṛhyasūtra; ed. L. A. Ravi Varma, Trivandrum 1940.
 AgnPr. Agnihotraprāyaścittāni; quoted from von Negelein, *Atharvaprāyaścittāni* (see AthPr.).
 AiU. Aitareyopaniṣad; ed. & tr. L. Silburn (*Les Upanishad* 10), 1950.
 ĀpGS. Āpastambagṛhyasūtra; ed. M. Winternitz, Vienna 1887; tr. H. Oldenberg in *The Gṛhya-sūtras* II (S.B.E. 30), 1892.
 ĀpMB. Āpastambamantrapāṭha; ed. M. Winternitz (*Anecd. Oxon.*, A.S. 8), 1897.
 ĀpPiS. Āpastambapitṛmedhasūtra; tr. see ĀpŚS. (Caland's tr., vol. III).
 ĀpŚS. Āpastambaśrautasūtra; ed. R. Garbe (*B.I.* 92), 1882-1902 (3 vols.); tr. W. Caland (*Quellen d. Religionsgesch. / Amsterdam Academy*), Göttingen-Amsterdam 1921-28 (3 vols.).
 Āsrama Upaniṣad; quoted from tr. Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*.
aṣṭādaśa smṛtayaḥ; ed. Khemarāja Śrīkrṣṇadāśaśreṣṭhin, Bombay 1908.
 ĀśvGP. Āśvalāyanagṛhyapariśiṣṭa; see ĀśvGS.
 ĀśvGS. Āśvalāyanagṛhyasūtra; ed. *Ān. S.G.* 105, 1936; tr. H. Oldenberg, *The Gṛhya-sūtras* I (S.B.E. 29), 1886.
 ĀśvP. Āśvalāyanagṛhyapariśiṣṭa; ed. K. Parameswara Aithal, Madras 1964 (repr. from *Adyar Libr. Bull.* 27) [different from ĀśvGPar.].
 ĀśvPr. Āśvalāyanaprāyaścittāni; quoted from J. von Negelein, *Atharvaprāyaścittāni* (see AthPr.).
 ĀśvŚS. Āśvalāyanaśrautasūtra; ed. *B.I.* 49, 1874; tr. K. Mylius, "Der erste Adhyāya des Āśvalāyana-Śrautasūtra", *Zs. f. Miss. u. Rel.* 51 (1967), SS. 246-258; 340-373; *A.O.* 34; *M.I.O.* 17; (to be continued).
 AthPr. Atharvaprāyaścittāni; ed. J. von Negelein, New Haven 1915 (also published in *J.A.O.S.* 33 & 34).
 AV. Atharvaveda; ed. R. Roth, W. D. Whitney and M. Lindenu, Bonn 1966⁸; tr. W. D. Whitney, *H.O.S.* 7-8, 1905, tr. M. Bloomfield, *S.B.E.* 42, 1879. No references to the Paippalāda rec.
 BĀU. (K./M.) Brhadāraṇyakopaniṣad (Kāṇva/Mādhyandina rec.); ed. and tr. É. Senart, Paris 1934 (K.; for the ed. of M. see ŚB.).
 BDhŚ. Baudhāyanadharmaśāstra (-sūtra); ed. E. Hultsch, *Abh. K.M.* 8/4 and 16/2, 1884¹ & 1922²; tr. G. Bühler, *S.B.E.* 14, 1882 (in *The Sacred Laws of the Aryas* II).

- BGS. Baudhāyanagr̥hyasūtra; ed. R. Shama Sastri, Mysore 1920.
 BGPar. Baudhāyanagr̥hyaparīśiṣṭasūtra; ed. & tr. N. V. Harting, *Selections from the Baudhāyana-gr̥hyaparīśiṣṭasūtra* (thesis Utrecht), Amersfoort 1922; ed. see BGS.
 BhāgP. Bhāgavatapurāṇa; tr. E. Burnouf (a.o.), Paris 1840-1898 (5 vols.); ed. Pāṇḍeya Rāmateja, Benares 1952.
 BhārGS. Bhāradvājagr̥hyasūtra; ed. H. W. J. Salomons (thesis Utrecht), Leiden 1913.
 BhārParS. Bhāradvājaparīśeṣasūtra; see BhārSS.
 BhārPiS. Bhāradvājapit̥medhasūtra; see BhārSS.
 BhārSS. Bhāradvājaśrautasūtra; ed. & tr. C. G. Kashikar, *The Śrauta, Pait̥rmedhika and Parīśeṣa Sūtras of Bhāradvāja* (2 vols.), Poona 1964.
 BhG. Bhagavadgīta; ed. & tr. R. C. Zaehner, Oxford 1969.
 BPiS. Baudhāyanapit̥medhasūtra; ed. W. Caland, *Abh. K.M.* 10/3, 1896 and C. H. Raabe, *Bijdrage tot de kennis van het Hindoesche doodenritueel* (thesis Utrecht), Leiden 1911.
 BrahmPr. Brahmaprāyaścittāni; quoted from J. von Negelein, *Atharva-prāyaścittāni* (see AthPr.).
 BSS. Baudhāyanaśrautasūtra; ed. W. Caland, *B.I.* 163 (3 vols.), 1904-23; ed. and tr. in *Śrautakośa*.
 ChMP. Chāndogyamantrapāṭha; quoted from Varenne, MNU. ed. & tr. II, p. 92.
 ChU. Chāndogyopaniṣad; ed. & tr. É. Senart, Paris 1930.
 DSS. Drāhyāyanaśrautasūtra; see LSS.
 GarP. Garuḍapurāṇa; ed. R. Bhaṭṭācārya, *K.S.S.* 165, 1964; tr. M. N. Dutt, Calcutta 1908. See also H. Losch, *Die Yājñavalkya-smṛti verglichen mit den Parallelen des Agni- und Garuḍapurāṇa*, Bonn 1927.
 Gautamasmṛti; quoted from W. Caland, "Der Gautamaśrāddhakalpa", *Bijdr. T.L.V.* 1895.
 GB. Gopathabrāhmaṇa; ed. D. Gaastra, Leiden 1919.
 GobhGS. Gobhilagr̥hyasūtra; ed. Cintamani Bhattacharya, Calcutta 1936; tr. H. Oldenberg, *S.B.E.* 30, 1892.
 GobhSm. Gobhilasmṛti (= Karmapradīpa); ed. *smṛtīnām samuccayaḥ* (see s.v.).
 GPiS. Gautamapit̥medhasūtra; ed. W. Caland, *Abh. K.M.* 10/3, 1896.
 Gr̥hasṭha-Ratnākara. *A Treatise on Smṛti by Caṇḍeśvara Ṭhakura*; ed. *B.I.* 249, 1928.
 Gr̥hyasaṃgraha (by Gobhilaputra); ed. & tr. M. Bloomfield, *Z.D.M.G.* 35 (1881), SS. 533-587.
 HirGS. Hiranyakeśigr̥hyasūtra; ed. J. Kirste, Vienna 1889; tr. H. Oldenberg, *S.B.E.* 30, 1892.
 HirPiS. Hiranyakeśipit̥medhasūtra; ed. W. Caland, *Abh. K.M.* 10/3, 1896.
 HirSS. Hiranyakeśīśrautasūtra (= Satyāśāḍhaśrautasūtra); ed. *Ān. S.G.* 53 (10 vols.), 1907-32.
 ĪśaU. Īśopaniṣad; ed. & tr. L. Renou, *Les Upanishad* 1, 1943.
 JB. Jaiminiyabrāhmaṇa; ed. Raghu Vira & Lokesh Chandra, *S.V.S.* 31, 1954; ed. Lokesh Chandra, *JB.* II, 1-80, *S.V.S.* 21 (thesis Utrecht), 1950; ed. Raghu Vira, *JB.* I, *S.V.S.* 2, Lahore 1937 (not available; repr. in *S.V.S.* 31); ed. & tr. W.

- Caland, *Das Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl*, Amsterdam Academy 1919; ed. & tr. H. Oertel, *JB.* I, 17-18; 46-50, *J.A.O.S.* 19, p. 103 ff. (see also E. Windisch, *Ber. K.S.G.W.* 59, SS. 111 ff.); *JB.* I, 42-44, *J.A.O.S.* 15, p. 233 ff.; *JB.* I, 45, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 134 ff.; ed. & tr. A. C. Burnell, *JB.* I, 42-44, *A Legend from the Talavahāra*, Mangalore 1878; tr. J. Hertel, *JB.* I, 17-18; 49-50, *Weisheit d. Up.*, SS. 150 ff.; tr. A. Frenz, *JB.* I, 17-18; 49-50, *I.I.J.* 11, p. 125 ff.; tr. S. Lévi, *JB.* I, 42-44, *Doctrine*, p. 100 ff.; tr. K. F. Geldner, *JB.* I, 42-44, *Ved. u. Brahm.*, SS. 78 ff.; ed. Veda Vyasa, *JB.* I, 1-7, *Specimen Pages*, Lahore 1928; ed. H. Oertel, *JB.* I, 1, *J.V.S.* 1, p. 152; *JB.* I, 9-10, *J.V.S.* 2, p. 168 f.; *JB.* I, 37, *J.V.S.* 2, p. 193 f.; *JB.* I, 19-20, *J.A.O.S.* 23, p. 328 ff.; *JB.* I, 51-65, *J.A.O.S.* 23, p. 331 ff.
 JGS. Jaiminiyagr̥hyasūtra; ed. W. Caland, Amsterdam Academy 1905; ed. & tr. W. Caland, Lahore 1922.
 JSS. Jaiminiyaśrautasūtra; ed. & tr. D. Gaastra (thesis Utrecht), Leiden 1906. See also Premnidhi Shastri's ed. of JSS-vṛtti, *Sata-Piṭaka Series* 40, 1966.
 JUB. Jaiminiyopaniṣadbrāhmaṇa; ed. & tr. H. Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 16 (1896), p. 79-260 (re-ed. Rama Deva, Lahore 1921); ed. B. R. Sharma, *Kendr. S.V.S.* 5-6 (together with Jaiminiyārṣeyabrāhmaṇa), 1967.
 KapS. Kapiṣṭhalakāṭhasaṃhitā; ed. Raghu Vira, Lahore 1925.
 KāthGS. Kāthakagr̥hyasūtra; ed. W. Caland, Lahore 1925.
 KauṣB. Kauṣitakibrāhmaṇa; see ŚāṅkhB.
 KauṣGS. Kauṣitakigr̥hyasūtra; quoted from *Śrautakośa*.
 KauṣS. Kauṣikasūtra; ed. M. Bloomfield, *J.A.O.S.* 14, 1890; see also Gonda, *Savayajñas*.
 KauṣU. Kauṣitakyupaniṣad; ed. & tr. L. Renou, *Les Upanishad* 6, 1948; ed. & tr. A. Frenz, *I.I.J.* 11 (1968-69), p. 79 ff. [with an appendix containing a German translation of *JB.* I, 17-18; 49-50].
 KhādGS. Khādiragr̥hyasūtra [= Drāhyāyanagr̥hyasūtra]; ed. Pat-tabhīramarya, Madras 1955; tr. H. Oldenberg, *S.B.E.* 29, 1886.
 KS. Kāthakasaṃhitā; ed. L. v. Schroeder, Leipzig 1900-1910 (3 vols.).
 KSS. Kātyāyanaśrautasūtra; ed. A. Weber, London 1859.
 KūrmP. Kūrmapurāṇa; ed. *B.I.*, 1890.
 LSS. Laghvāśvalāyanasmṛti; ed. *smṛtīnām samuccayaḥ* (see s.v.).
 Lāṭyāyanaśrautasūtra; ed. *B.I.* 63, 1872 (referring in footnotes to the version of DSS.; that sūtra was partly edited by J. N. Reuter, London 1904 and Raghu Vira, *J.V.S.* I, 1, 1934); tr. A. Parpola, *The Śrautasūtras of Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyana and their commentaries*. Vol. I: 1. *General Introduction and Appendices to Vol. I* (thesis Helsinki). Vol. I: 2. *The agniṣṭoma (LSS.I-II, DSS I-VI)*. Helsinki 1968-69.
 MahāNT. Mahānirvāṇatantra; ed. (*Tantrik Texts* 13) & tr. A. Avalon (Sir John Woodroffe), Madras 1929 & 1913.
 MaiU. Maitrāyaṇīyopaniṣad; ed. & tr. J. A. B. van Buitenen, *The Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad. A Critical Essay, with Text, Translation and Commentary*, The Hague 1962; [= Maitryupa-

- Manu (smṛti) niṣad; ed. & tr. A. M. Esnoul, *Les Upaniṣad* 15, 1952]. (= Mānavadharmasāstra); ed. J. Jolly, London 1887; tr. G. Bühler, *S.B.E.* 25, 1886.
- MārKP. Mārkaṇḍeyapurāṇa; ed. K. M. Banerjea, *B.I.*, 1855-62; tr. F. E. Pargiter, *B.I.*, 1888-99.
- MBh. Mahābhārata; crit. ed. by V. S. Sukthankar a.o., Poona; tr. P. Ch. Roy, Calcutta 1883-96.
- MGS. Mānavagṛhyasūtra; ed. F. Knaur, Petrograd 1897; tr. M. J. Dresden (thesis Utrecht), Groningen 1941.
- MNU. Mahānārāyaṇopaniṣad; ed. & tr. J. Varenne, *La Mahā Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad ... et, en annexe, La Prāṇāgnihotra Upaniṣad*. I. Texte, Traduction, Notes. II. Étude, Tables, Index et Appendices. Paris 1960. Also edited in TĀ.
- MS. Maitrāyaṇīsamhitā; ed. L. v. Schroeder, Leipzig 1881-86.
- MŚS. Mānavasrautasūtra; ed. & tr. J. M. van Gelder, *Sata-Piṭaka Series* 17 & 27, 1961-63.
- Parāśaramādhava; see Parāśarasamṛti.
- Parāśarasamṛti; ed. (with the commentary of Mādhavacharya) *B.I.*, 1890-99 (3 vols.).
- Pañcatantra; quoted from J. Gonda, *Kurze Elementar-Grammatik der Sanskrit-Sprache (Lesestücke IV)*.
- PārGS. Pāraskaraḡhyasūtra; ed. & tr. A. F. Stenzler, *Abh. K.M.* 6/2 & 6/4, 1876-78; tr. H. Oldenberg, *S.B.E.* 29, 1886.
- PB. Pañcaviṃśabrāhmaṇa (= Tāṇḍyamahābrāhmaṇa); ed. A. Chinnaswami Śāstri & Pattābhīrāma Śāstri, *K.S.S.* 105, 1934-1935 (2 vols.); tr. W. Caland, *B.I.* 255, 1931.
- PrāṇU. Prāṇāgnihotropāniṣad; ed. & tr. see MNU.
- PrapT. Prapañcasāratāntra; ed. (with Padmapāda's comm. Vivaraṇa and its gloss, the Prayogakramadīpikā) A. Avalon, *Tantrik Texts* 18 & 19, Calcutta 1935.
- PrU. Prasnopaniṣad; ed. & tr. J. Bousquet, *Les Upanishad* 8, 1948.
- Rām. Rāmāyaṇa; crit. ed. by G. H. Bhatt a.o., Baroda 1960-00.
- Rgvidh. Rgvidhāna; ed. R. Meyer, Berlin 1878; tr. J. Gonda, Utrecht 1951.
- RV. Rgvedasamhitā; ed. T. Aufrecht, Berlin 1861-63; tr. K. F. Geldner, *H.O.S.* 33-35, 1951, and partly by L. Renou in *E.V.P.*
- ṢaḍvB. Ṣaḍviṃśabrāhmaṇa; ed. H. F. Eelsingh (thesis Utrecht), Leiden 1908; ed. B. R. Sharma, *Kendr. S.V.S.* 9, 1967; tr. W. B. Bollée (thesis Utrecht), Utrecht 1956.
- śaṃḍhyābhāṣyasamuccayaḥ; ed. *Ān. S.G.* 40, 1899.
- Samvartasmṛti; ed. *smṛtīnām samuccayaḥ*.
- ŚāṅkhĀ. Śāṅkhāyanāranyaka; ed. *Ān. S.G.* 90, 1922; ed. A. B. Keith (books VII-XV as appendix to AĀ. ed.); tr. A. B. Keith, London 1908.
- ŚāṅkhB. Śāṅkhasmṛti; ed. *smṛtīnām samuccayaḥ*.
- ŚāṅkhB. Śāṅkhāyanabrāhmaṇa (= Kauṣītakibrāhmaṇa); ed. B. Lindner, Jena 1887 (quoted with 2 figures); ed. E. R. Sreekrishna Sarma, *Verzeichnis Or. Handschr. in Deutschland. Suppl.* 9/1, Wiesbaden 1968 (quoted with 3 figures); tr. A. B. Keith, *H.O.S.* 25, 1920.
- ŚātB. Śātyāyanibrāhmaṇa; fragments ed. in Ghosh, *Lost Brāhmaṇas*.

- ŚB. (M./K.) Śatapathabrāhmaṇa (Mādhyaṇḍina/Kāṇva rec.; unless otherwise specified the M. rec. is quoted); ed. A. Weber, London 1855; tr. J. Eggeling, *S.B.E.* 12; 26; 41; 43; 44, 1882-1900; ed. K. rec. W. Caland, Lahore 1926 (introd. and part of the text); ed. Raghu Vira, Lahore 1939 (vols. 2 & 3 containing the rest of the text; not available).
- ŚGS. Śāṅkhāyanagṛhyasūtra; ed. & tr. H. Oldenberg, *I.S.* 15; tr. H. Oldenberg, *S.B.E.* 29, 1886.
- ŚivU. Śivopaniṣad; ed. in *Un-published Upanishads* (Adyar Library), Adyar 1933.
- Smṛticandrikā* by Devaṇṇabhāṭṭa, II *Āhnikakāṇḍaḥ*; V *Śrāddhakāṇḍaḥ*; ed. *Gvt. Or. Libr.*, *B.S.* 44 & 52, 1914 & 1918.
- smṛtīnām samuccayaḥ*; ed. *Ān. S.G.* 48, 1929.
- Somaśambhupaddhati; ed. & tr. Hélène Brunner-Lachaux, *Le rituel quotidien dans la tradition śivaite de l'Inde du Sud selon Somaśambhu*, Pondichéry 1963.
- śrāddhamañjarī*; ed. *Ān. S.G.* 59, 1909.
- ŚŚS. Śāṅkhāyanaśrautasūtra; ed. A. Hillebrandt, *B.I.* 99, 1888-97 (3 vols.); tr. W. Caland, *S.V.S.* 32, 1953 (ed. by Lokesh Chandra).
- SV. Sāmavedasamhitā; quoted from Bloomfield's *Vedic Concordance*.
- TĀ. Taittirīyāranyaka; ed. Rajendralal Mitra, *B.I.*, 1872; TĀ. X = MNU. (ed. & tr. Varenne).
- Tārābhaktisudhārnava; ed. Pañcānana Bhaṭṭācārya, *Tantrik Texts* 21, 1940.
- TB. Taittirīyabrāhmaṇa; ed. Rajendralal Mitra, *B.I.*, 1859-1890 (3 vols.).
- TS. Taittirīyasamhitā; ed. A. Weber, *I.S.* 11-12, 1871-72; tr. A. B. Keith, *H.O.S.* 18-19, 1914.
- TU. Taittirīyopaniṣad; ed. & tr. Em. Lesimple, *Les Upanishad* 9, 1948.
- TUBh. Taittirīyopaniṣadbhāṣya; ed. *Ān. S.G.* 12, 1929.
- TUBhV. Taittirīyopaniṣadbhāṣyavārtika (by Sureśvara); ed. *Ān. S.G.* 13, 1889; tr. J. M. van Boetzelaer (thesis Utrecht), Leiden 1971.
- Uśana Samhitā; tr. M. N. Dutt, *The Dharma Śāstra or Hindu Law Codes*, Calcutta 1908.
- VādhS. Vādhūlasūtra; partly ed. & tr. W. Caland, *A.O.* 2, p. 142-167; 4, p. 1-41, 161-213; 6, p. 97-241, 1924-1928. For the pure śrautasūtra portions dealing with the agnihotra (i.e. without the anvākyānas) I had access to a ms.-transcript made by Caland (in University Library Utrecht).
- VaiDhS. Vaikhānasadharmaśūtra; tr. W. Eggers, Göttingen 1929; tr. K. Rangachari, Madras 1930. See also VaiSmS.
- VaiGS. Vaikhānasagṛhyasūtra; see VaiSmS.
- VaiSmS. Vaikhānasasmārtasūtra (= VaiDhS. & VaiGS.); ed. & tr. W. Caland, *B.I.* 242 & 251, 1927 & 1929.
- VaiŚS. Vaikhānasaśrautasūtra; ed. W. Caland, *B.I.* 265, 1941.
- VaitS. Vaitānasūtra; ed. R. Garbe, London 1878; tr. W. Caland, Amsterdam Academy, 1910.
- VārGS. Vārāhagṛhyasūtra; ed. Raghu Vira (thesis Utrecht), Lahore 1932.

- VārPar. Vārāhapariśiṣṭa; quoted from *Śrautakośa*.
 VārŚS. Vārāhaśrautasūtra; ed. W. Caland & Raghu Vira, Lahore 1933.
 VāsDhŚ. Vāsiṣṭhadharmaśāstra; ed. A. A. Führer, Bombay 1883; tr. G. Bühler, *S.B.E.* 14, 1882.
 ViṣṇP. Viṣṇupurāṇa; tr. H. H. Wilson, London 1840.
 ViṣṇSm. Viṣṇusmṛti; ed. *Adyar Libr. Series*, 1893; tr. J. Jolly, *S.B.E.* 7, 1880.
 VS. Vṛddha-Hārta Sm.; ed. *smṛtinām samuccayaḥ*.
 Vājaneyisaṃhitā; ed. A. Weber, London 1852.
 Vyāsa Sm.; ed. *smṛtinām samuccayaḥ*.
 YājñSm. Yājñavalkyasmṛti; ed. & tr. A. F. Stenzler, Berlin 1849; ed. H. Losch, Leipzig 1927. See also H. Losch, *Die Yājñavalkyasmṛti verglichen mit den Parallelen des Agni- und Garuḍapurāṇa*, Bonn 1927.
 Yatidharmasamgraha by Viśveśvara Sarasvatī; ed. *Ān. S.* G. 60, 1909.

Series, Journals, etc.

- Abh. K.M. *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Leipzig.
 Abh. K.S.G.W. *Abhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Leipzig.
 Agn. a. *Prāṇāgn.* *Agnihotra and Prāṇāgnihotra* (the second part of this work).
 A.I.O.C. *Proceedings and transactions of the ... All-India Oriental Conference*.
 Amsterdam Academy *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde*, Amsterdam.
 Anecd. Oxon., A.S. *Anecdota Oxoniensia, Aryan Series*, Oxford.
 Ān. S.G. *Ānandāśramasamskṛtagraṇthāvalīḥ*, Poona.
 A.O. *Acta Orientalia*, Leyden.
 Ber. K.S.G.W. *Berichte über die Verhandlungen der königlich sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*, Leipzig.
 B.I. *Bibliotheca Indica*, Calcutta.
 Bijdr. T.L.V. *Bijdragen tot de taal-, land-, en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië*, The Hague.
 Bull. Madras Govt. Mus. *Bulletin of the Madras Government Museum*, Madras.
 E.V.P. *Études védiques et pāṇinienes* (by L. Renou), Paris.
 Fs. *Festschrift* (Felicitation Volume).
 Govt. Or. Libr., B.S. *Government Oriental Library, Bibliotheca Sanskrita*, Mysore.
 H.J.A.S. *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies*.
 H.O.S. *Harvard Oriental Series*, Cambridge (Mass.).
 I.C. *Indian Culture*.
 I.H.Q. *Indian Historical Quarterly*.
 I.I.J. *Indo-Iranian Journal*.
 I.O.C. *Indian Oriental Conference* (see also A.I.O.C.).
 I.S. *Indische Studien*, Leipzig.
 J.A.O.S. *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.

- J. As. *Journal Asiatique*.
 J.I.B.S. *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*, Tokyo.
 J.I.S.O.A. *Journal of the Indian Society of Oriental Arts*.
 J.O.R.M. *Journal of Oriental Research Madras*.
 J.R.A.S. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*.
 J.V.S. *Journal of Vedic Studies*, Lahore.
 Kendr. S.V.S. *Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha Series*, Tirupati.
 K.S.S. *Kāshi Sanskrit Series*, Benares.
 K.Z. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung begründet von A. Kuhn*.
 Les Upanishad. *Texte et traduction sous la direction de Louis Renou*, Paris.
 M.I.O. *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung*, Berlin.
 M.S.S. *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft*.
 Nachr. K.G.W. *Göttingen Nachrichten von der K. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Berlin.
 N.I.A. *New Indian Antiquary*.
 Sata-Pitaka Series, New Delhi (International Academy of Indian Culture).
 Sb. Akad. Berlin *Sitzungsberichte der Kgl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*.
 S.B.E. *Sacred Books of the East*, Oxford.
 S.V.S. *Sarasvatī-Vihara Series*, Nagpur (originally Lahore).
 Tantrik Texts (under the general editorship of A. Avalon), London-Madras.
 Trans. Conn. Acad. *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, New Haven.
 A. & Sc. *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, New Haven.
 Versl. Meded. Kon. Akad. v. Wetensch., Afd. Letterk. *Verslagen en Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeling Letterkunde*, Amsterdam.
 Wiss. Zs. Univ. Halle-Wittenberg *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität Halle-Wittenberg* (Gesellschafts- und sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe).
 W.Z.K.M. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*.
 W.Z.K.S.O. *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens*.
 Z.D.M.G. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*.
 Z.I.I. *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik*, Leipzig.
 Zs. f. Kath. Theol. *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*.
 Zs. f. Miss. u. Rel. *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft*.

INTRODUCTION

A. This introduction will be brief for the following reasons:

a) It does not refer to the second part of this work, *Agnihotra and Prāṇāgnihotra*, which has its own introduction and summary with conclusions.

b) It does not deal with the complete Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa because only a small section is presented here in translation. Nor does it give an elaborate treatment of the position of the Jaiminīyas in the Sāmavedic literature. This may be reserved for a later occasion. In the future I intend to carry on this study of JB. and to tackle the *agniṣṭoma* section (I, 66-364). Much has already been written on JB. and the history of the Jaiminīya studies. A short outline may suffice for the present purpose.

c) The main emphasis has to fall on the agnihotra (and its position in JB.) and the composition of JB. I, 1-65. My analysis of this portion of the brāhmaṇa is already indicated by the arrangement in sections. Every section has its own introduction which deals extensively with the contents, related passages, doctrines, etc.

d) On the ritual of the agnihotra enough material is available: P.-E. Dumont, *L'Agnihotra* (Baltimore 1939); *Śrautakośa I, Sanskrit Section* (Poona 1958), pp. 55-121; *English Section* (Poona 1958), pp. 85-198. Its meta-ritualism in the brāhmaṇas and the interpretation of its meaning has received less attention from the Vedists. Mostly it is regarded as a solar charm (see Dumont, o.c., p. VIII). To this characteristic Dumont, o.c., p. VII adds the following: "un des principaux objets de l'agnihotra est de perpétuer à la fois la continuité du sacrifice et la continuité de la race du sacrificant". "L'agnihotra est un sacrifice qui a pour objet de procurer au sacrificant la prospérité, la santé, la longévité, la richesse en bétail et, surtout, une nombreuse descendance mâle, c'est-à-dire la continuité de la race". This may be correct if applied to a particular period and to particular circles of ritualists. Other aims are obviously present in the later periods. On the early agnihotra Oldenberg, *Die Religion des Veda*, p. 437 f. observes that it may be doubted "ob sie der ursprünglichen Intention nach vollwertige Opfer sind; es scheint zutreffender, sie in erster Linie als die regelmässige, freilich, wie sich von selbst

versteht, kultisch ausgestaffierte Bedienung des Opferfeuers zu verstehen, die zu dessen Erhaltung notwendig ist". A study of the agnihotra sections in Vedic prose has not yielded enough evidence for new conclusions on the original and basic meaning of this rite. The esoteric interpretations of the brāhmaṇas, however, offered interesting starting-points for the *prāṇāgnihotra*, especially in the context of JB. All this is to be found in the study *Agnihotra and Prāṇāgnihotra*, in which i.a. the background of JB. 1, 1-2; 18; 19-20; 22-25; 45-46; 49-50 is discussed and a survey of the symbolism of the agnihotra is given.

e) The section 1, 51-65 dealing with the *prāyaścittis* forms an independent unit and has been treated as such with a separate introduction. The introductions of the single expiations discuss all the relevant parallels (including the sūtras). Since the expiation section of JB. (which was borrowed from ŚB.) forms the most elaborate one in the brāhmaṇas, it is not exaggerated to state that the *agnihotra-prāyaścittis* have been studied and interpreted in this book.

f) The same applies *mutatis mutandis* to 1, 46-49 dealing with the funeral rites. Its introduction contains a detailed discussion of the *pātracayanam* (the piling of the sacrificial implements upon the corpse) and its development in the Vedic texts. Indeed, texts rather than customs seem to have been (orally?) transmitted. Furthermore the relation to the funeral rites as found in the Jaiminiya Gṛhyasūtra and its commentary (the Subodhini) are discussed.

B. History of the Jaiminiya Studies

For an elaborate survey see A. Frenz, *Über die Verben im Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa* (thesis Marburg 1966), p. IX ff. The discovery of the brāhmaṇa was announced as early as 1877 by the famous specialist of the Sāmaveda Arthur Coke Burnell, who was the first to edit a passage from JB. (the story of Bhṛgu; see the introduction to Section 42-44) in 1878. His manuscripts were transferred to Whitney, who had a transliterated copy made and who induced Oertel to edit parts of the text. See the complete list of these articles by Oertel in the introduction to Lokesh Chandra's critical edition of this text (p. VII). For a detailed survey of the contents of these papers see also Frenz, o.c., p. XI f. and Oertel, *Trans. Conn. Acad. A. & Sc.* 15, 1909, p. 203 f.). Oertel prepared a complete edition and translation of the Jaiminiya (or Talavakāra) Upaniṣad Brāhmaṇa in *J.A.O.S.*

16 (1894) [reprinted in devanāgarī by Rāma Deva, Lahore 1921; a new edition of this text together with the Jaiminiyārṣeya Brāhmaṇa was made by B. R. Sharma, Tirupati 1967]. He remarks, o.c., p. 80 that Burnell's manuscripts of the JB. proper are "altogether insufficient to found a complete edition upon". Nevertheless he seems to have promised a critical edition with an English translation for the Harvard Sanskrit Series in 1905. This did not appear. Caland, considering a publication of the whole brāhmaṇa to be out of the question, wrote a long paper (in Dutch) in which all relevant information on this brāhmaṇa has been collected: "Over en uit het Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa", *Versl. Meded. Kon. Akad. v. Wetensch., Afd. Letterk.* Vijfde Reeks I (Amsterdam 1915), p. 1-106. A German summary of that part of the article which deals with the relation between JB. and other texts is to be found in Frenz, o.c., p. I ff. See also Caland's English introduction to his translation of PB. (p. XVIII ff.). Later Caland published an anthology (with German translation): *Das Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl* (Amsterdam Academy 1919). The next important date was 1928 when Veda Vyasa published eight specimen pages of a complete edition of JB. planned by him. He wrote a paper "The Literature of the Jaiminīyas", *Proceedings Fifth I.O.C.*, I (Lahore 1930), p. 292-298 in which he states that "it is indeed a very pleasant duty to-day to inform (...) that the critical edition of the JB. is not a mere possibility — it has been achieved to a considerable extent". In a letter to Caland, dated 9th august 1928 (Utrecht University Library, *Caland MSS.*, nr. 42), he enclosed as specimen pages the text of JB. 1, 1-7 with notes and some notes on 1, 11; 17; 18; 20; 22; 24; 28 and announced the completion of his edition and a visit to Utrecht (where under supervision of Caland the work would be finished). Unfortunately one does not hear anymore about Veda Vyasa. The material for his edition was passed on to Raghu Vira. The latter's son, Prof. Lokesh Chandra, informed me in a letter that these papers were just collation sheets.

The first book of JB. was critically edited by Raghu Vira (*Sarasvatī Vihāra Series*, Lahore 1937) and reprinted with the complete text in 1954 (*Sarasvatī Vihāra Series* 31). The first edition, which was not available to me, does not seem to have contained any description of the manuscripts used. No information on these manuscripts is available according to Prof. Lokesh Chandra (information by letter) and according to Prof. Raghavan.

The remaining portion of the text was edited by Lokesh Chandra

(Nagpur 1954), who first edited (with elaborate introduction and copious notes) the *gavāmayana* portion JB. 2, 1-80 (*Sarasvatī Vihāra Series* 21, Nagpur 1950), submitted as a thesis to prof. Gonda at Utrecht.

A paper called "Studies in the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa" (*Studia Indologica, Fs. Kirfel*, Bonn 1955, p. 255-277; = *A.O.* 22, p. 55-74) [on the first book to which Lokesh Chandra's introductions of S.V.S. 21 and 31 do not refer] was published by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra. It contains useful information on material to be used along with the critical edition of the first book. For a critical review with several emendations of the complete brāhmaṇa see K. Hoffmann, "Textkritisches zum Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa", *I.I.J.* 4 (1960), p. 1-36. Emendations (of the passages edited by Oertel) were already made in 1914 by Caland, "Emendationen zum Jaiminiya-brāhmaṇa", *W.Z.K.M.* 28. On the verbs of JB. see the thesis by Frenz (mentioned above) as well as Oertel, "Roots and Verb-Forms", *J.V.S.* I-II (1934-35). A translation of JB. 2, 371-373 (dealing with the *gavāmayana*) was made by D. Schrapel in 1970 as a part of a thesis (Marburg 1970; *Untersuchung der Partikel* iva ..., p. 1-13).

On the Jaiminiya literature in general see Caland, *Die Jaiminiya-Saṃhitā mit einer Einleitung über die Sāmavedaliteratur* (Breslau 1907); idem, *De Literatuur van den Sāmaveda en het Jaiminigrhyasūtra* (Amsterdam Academy 1905); idem, *The Jaiminigrhyasūtra* (Lahore 1922); D. Gaastra, *Bijdrage tot de kennis van het Vedische ritueel. Jaiminiyaśrautasūtra* (thesis Utrecht; Leiden 1906); Premnidhi Shastri, *Jaiminiya-śrauta-sūtra-vṛtti of Bhavatrāta* (New Delhi 1966); A. Parpola, "On the Jaiminiya-śrautasūtra and Its Annexes", *Orientalia Suecana* 16 (1967), p. 181-214; idem, *The Śrautasūtras of Lātyāyana and Drāhyāyana and their commentaries*, I: 1 *General Introduction* (thesis Helsinki 1968), p. 48 f.; 91; 95 f. Parpola is preparing an edition of the complete JSS.

C. The Text

The critical edition, though being welcome as the first edition of this important brāhmaṇa, is open to improvement (even with regard to the first book which "was published as soon as 1937 .. in an irreproachable manner" according to Renou in his foreword to the edition of 1954). See also K. Hoffmann, *I.I.J.* 4, p. 1 ff. Since

there are vague indications that a new critical edition of JB. may be expected in the future and since I was not able to obtain sufficient manuscripts, I decided to base my translation on the printed text. This is not to say that I have blindly followed the text as edited by Raghu Vira. The following survey refers to emendations, conjectures, textcritical remarks etc. which are found in the notes. Some of them were made by others, most of them are new.

SECTION

1-2, n. 15	'nakāmamāra for 'nnaṃ kāmāyāmāna	[3. 29]
n. 17	svaṃ yad for svar yad	[3. 30]
3-4, n. 2	ayāzm ayāzm for ayāmayām	[4. 10]
5-6, n. 3	mahāntāv a gloss?	[5. 3]
	padau for pādau	[5. 3]
	patheva for caryeva	[5. 3]
n. 8	yathā vai *—ṣavam/*—ṣacam (?)	
	for yathā vaiṣavam (?)	[5. 6]
(n. 13)	sahasraṃ vā. dyumnā nāha nāma for sahasraṃ vā dyumnān. dyumnā ha nāma	[502. 7]
n. 14	discussion of upamathnītām ito yathā reṣṇopamathnyād evam and Caland's and miss Narten's emendations	[7. 11]
12-14, n. 3	etemam for ete 'mum	[7. 16 f.]
n. 4	aṣeṣma for aṣeṣu	[7. 25]
17-18, n. 5	abhinivartate (?) for abhinivartate	[9. 1]
n. 10	sa yad asmāl lokād or sa yo 'smāl lokād for sa yasmāl lokād	[9. 7]
n. 12	sa heyattām for sa he ya ttā	[9. 10]
n. 26	saṃ tad vide for samaṃ tad vide	[9. 16]
n. 31	pratipanna for pratipatta	[9. 21]
19-20, n. 2	prattām for pṛktām	[9. 38; 10. 1]
n. 3	pūrvam yat for pūrvam. yat	[10. 1]
n. 12	prāṇo vāva for prāṇo vā	[10. 37]
21 (introd.)	A complete reconstruction of the first paragraph	[11. 3 ff.]
21, n. 6	sammukhe (?) for samunmukhe	[11. 10]
n. 7	atihāya for etihāya	[11. 10]

- 22-25, (n. 1) *barkur vārṣṇas* or *vārṣṇis* for *prakur vārṣṇas* [102. 17]]
- n. 3 *brahmacāriṇam* for *brahmavādinam* [11. 18]
- n. 13 *upadiśann uvācedam* for *upadiśan vācedam* [11. 32; 12. 4, 14, 22, 33 (*uvācāyam*); 13. 4 f. (*uvāceyam*)]
- n. 19 *kāṇḍviya* (?) for *kāṇḍvīya* [12. 21]
- 26-38, n. 4 *idaṃ sarvaṃ. yad ..* for *idaṃ sarvaṃ yad ..* and *prativyādādāti. sarvaṃ tad ..* for *prativyādādāti. sarvaṃ tad ..* [13. 29 f.]
- n. 5 *yāvajjivānāsakavratī* for *yāvaj jivānāśakapratī* [13. 31]
- n. 11 *pravṛktas* (?) for *pravṛttas* [14. 3]
- n. 15 *yamayati* for *yamiti* [14. 6]
- n. 33 *prajātim* for *prajāpatim* [15. 22]
- n. 35 *enad* or *evaṃ* for *enaṃ* [15. 32]
- n. 41 *ādhānapratihito* for *ādadhānaḥ prahito* [16. 9]
- 39-41, n. 16 *iti tūṣṇīm* for *iti. tūṣṇīm* [16. 35]
(moreover the formulas seem to begin with *puruṣa it samit* [16. 34])
- 42-44, n. 11 *udācīre* for *udacīre* [18. 4]
- n. 13 *āgās* for *āgas* [18. 12]
- n. 14 *kiṃ tātāz iti* for *kiṃ tateti* [18. 13]
- 42-44, n. 15 *juhvato* for *ajuhvato* [18. 15, 19, 23, 28; 19. 3]
- n. 20 See n. 15
- n. 18 *tūṣṇīm vyāharantam* for *tūṣṇīm avyāharantam* [17. 33; 18. 22]
- n. 9 See n. 18
- n. 19 *ajugupatām* for *ajugupatām* [18. 27]
- n. 21 *dvir* to be inserted before *aṅgulyā* [18. 30]
- 45-46/
- 49-50, n. 7 *stry evāgnir* for *striyo vā agnir* [19. 33]
- n. 9 *yadā* for *yathā* [20. 2]
- n. 34 *tata* (?) for *tataḥ* [22. 5]
- 46-49 (introd.) The punctuation of the formulas *ayaṃ vai tvad ..* should be changed (a *daṇḍa* after *etad* and *jātavedas*) because of the

- metre and the parallels. Perhaps *nayāsy* for *nayā hy* [20. 30 ff.]
- īloṣapavahanam* for *īloṣapavahanam* [21. 3]
- 46-49, n. 2 *subhūmi spaṣṭam* for *subhūmispaṣṭam* [20. 17, 21]
- n. 5 *hareyur anvāhāryapacanād ulmukam. ādadīran ..* for *hareyuh. anvāhāryapacanād ilmukam ādadīran ..* [20. 20]
- n. 13 *antarenāgnī nidhāya* (?) for *antarenāgnīn nidhāya* [20. 29]
- n. 14 *gatvā* for *matvā* [20. 30]
- n. 20 *samavattadhānīm* for *samvartadhānīm* [21. 3]
- 46-49, n. 21 *upari (ni)dadhati* for *upanidadhati* [21. 5]
- n. 26 *apasalī* for *apasalīm* [21. 9]
- n. 30 *parivyayanti* for *parivayanti* [21. 11]
- A *daṇḍa* should be placed after this word.
- n. 32 (see also the introd.) Part of the upo-
ṣana passage seems to be secondary [21. 14 f.]
- 51-52, n. 4 *agnihotraṃ juhvato* for *agnim juhvato* [22. 14]
- n. 10 *saṃcaranti* for *ca caranti* [22. 20]
- n. 13 *samejet/samejayeta* (?) for *sannejīyeta* [22. 23]
- n. 15 *nivapanto yanti gārhapatyād āhavanīyāt* for *nivapanto yanti. gārhapatyād āhavanīyān ninayann iyāt* [22. 29 f.]
- n. 17 *param āsān* for *paramāsān* [22. 31]
- 53-54, n. 9 *saṃcitya* for *saṃcintya* [23. 20]
- 55-56, n. 2 *bībhatsanta iti* for *bībhatsa iti* [24. 3]
- n. 3 *bībhatsantāz id u devāḥ* for *bībhatsantāz devāḥ* [24. 4]
- 56
- (last §), n. 1 *adhyasya* for *adhyasyan* (?) [24. 32]
- 57, n. 1 *evādaś* for *evādayaś* [25. 7]
- 58-59 (introd.) *avṛttīyā hi tam vidhyanti* seems to be corrupt. The original reading may be *ārtyāhutiṃ vidhyanti* [25. 25 f.]
- 60, n. 4 *suṣṛṣṭam* for *susṛṣṭam* and *abhiniṣadyeva* (?) for *abhiniṣady eva* [26. 3 f.]
- 61, n. 6 *upāha tam* for *upa ha tam* [26. 20]
- n. 7 *ulmukamathya* (?) for *ulmukamathyāyām* [26. 20]

n. 8	<i>ananugato</i> for <i>anugato</i>	[26. 22]
n. 10	<i>yo ha</i> for <i>yo 'nga</i>	[26. 25 f.]
n. 14	<i>eva mathitvopasamādadhati</i> for <i>evam avadhivopasamādadhati</i>	[26. 32]
n. 17	<i>iti vā. sa udavasāya</i> for <i>iti vāsa udavasāya</i>	[27. 4]
62-63, n. 4	<i>yathā vā ada</i> for <i>yathā vā adavada</i>	[27. 18]
n. 7	<i>yatra vai dīptam</i> .. an interpolation?	[27. 28]

I have consulted a transliterated copy made by Caland (Utrecht University Library, Caland MSS., nr. 6) of the Grantha ms. Burnell 421 (= Keith 4353) in which evident mistakes of the transcribers have been emended without being mentioned and the particularities of the Grantha have been neglected (at least partly). The copy was collated with and emended according to Burnell 500 and compared interlinearly with another manuscript not specified by Caland (who states that it is generally bad). A Grantha manuscript of the International Academy of Indian Culture of which a microfilm was obtained by Professor Gonda through kind mediation of Professor Lokesh Chandra turned out to offer nothing new. It almost completely agrees with the Burnell mss. as a comparison with Caland's copy has shown me. In the new Indian manuscript even the same omissions and evident mistakes are found. Two transliterated copies of JB. mss. made by E. Krishna Warriess (13. 12. '33; 15. 1. '34; 12. 3. '34) which were acquired by Utrecht University Library some years ago only contain portions of the second book (2, 1-340; 2, 1-333; "1-37" = 2, 334-370).

No details are available on the manuscripts of the first book. One may assume that they agree with Veda Vyasa's material which was transferred to Raghu Vira. Veda Vyasa, who states in his letter to Caland that he had finished the first book, marks his mss. A-F. To some extent this agrees with Raghu Vira's *ya-ṣa*. Comparing the specimen pages one may gather that at least *ya* and A, *ra* and B and *śa* and E are identical. The correspondence between Vyasa's six mss. and Raghu Vira's mss. (in which *la* is differentiated into *la*¹ and *la*²) is, however, not complete. The edition of the second and third books is mainly based on three mss. (Burnell 421, 422 and a Baroda MS.). See Lokesh Chandra, *Gavāmayana*, p. XV f.; Frenz, o.c., p. XV f.; D. Schrapel, *Untersuchung der Partikel iva*, p. XIII. The ms. *ya* seems to represent the Baroda MS. (Frenz, o.c., p. XVI). Since

the agnihotra section is not found in Burnell 422, it is to be assumed that Raghu Vira's *ya-ṣa* should refer to several other manuscripts besides the Baroda and Burnell MSS. (B 421 and 500 a?). In his letter to Caland Veda Vyasa mentions that he had used "three complete mss. besides the Burnell collection" for the first book. In his paper read before the *Fifth I.O.C.* he mentions the Burnell MSS., the Baroda MS. and among others a manuscript from Mysore. Probably this formed the basic material of the critical edition of 1937.

D. *The position of JB. 1, 1-65 within the brāhmaṇa itself and in relation to other texts*

In "Over en uit het JB." Caland's discussion of the relation between JB. and the other brāhmaṇas pays much attention to a comparison of JB. and PB. (for an English summary see Caland's translation of PB., p. XVIII ff.). His view that JB. is older than the other Sāmavedic brāhmaṇa has not been universally accepted. If it is correct, an exception should be made for the agnihotra section which is not found in PB. and which is obviously rather late. Caland, o.c., p. 4 observes that the inclusion of the agnihotra in this text intended for the udgātṛ *cum suis* is remarkable. He refers to ŚāṅkhB., the brāhmaṇa of the *hotṛ*, as a parallel. One may also compare AB. In GB. the agnihotra is also found, but there it occurs in an esoteric passage; a brahmodya borrowed from ŚB. The R̥gvedic sūtras ĀśvŚS. and ŚŚS. as well as the Atharvan VaitS. (not to mention the AthPr.) deal with this rite. Caland, "Über das Vaitānasūtra", *W.Z.K.M.* 14 (1900), p. 122 is correct in stating: "Dass Vait. 7 das Agnihotra als eine vom Brahman zu verrichtende Ceremonie ausführlich und vollständig dargestellt wird, ist ebensowenig auffallend als dass es auch in den für den Hotar bestimmten Sūtras behandelt wird. Es kann ja auch vom Yajamāna selbst verrichtet werden". Indeed the Sāmavedic or Atharvan sacrificer who performs the agnihotra himself may be expected to follow his own text or school. On the other hand there was no practical reason why the Sāmavedic brahmins should develop their own texts with regard to the agnihotra. The practical precepts could have been adopted from a related Yajurvedic school. The esoterism of this rite originally was left to the Yajurveda (KS.; MS.; TB.); the Sāmaveda and the other Vedas had their own specialities. The search for completeness and

above all prestige seems to have introduced the agnihotra in the texts of the other Vedas. Moreover in course of time discussions on particular ritualistic (expiations!) and esoteric (offering before or after sunrise) questions arose which involved the participation of all agnihotrans. It is striking that a brāhmaṇa like AB. deals mainly with a very extensive discussion of the right time for the performance and with some expiations. A systematical treatment (as in KS.; MS.; TB.; ŚB.) is not found in the agnihotra sections of AB. which seem to belong to the younger portions of the text. It is only in the later agnihotra section of ŚāṅkhB. that a more elaborate treatment of the whole agnihotra is found. The agnihotra section of JB. seems to form a late Sāmavedic attempt to join the discussion and play a role among the other brāhmaṇas. As such it may be regarded as an addition (which is usually placed at the beginning or the end of a text). Otherwise the chronology of the whole JB. would need a profound revision.

A remarkable difference between JB. 1, 1-65 and the apparently older Ṛgvedic brāhmaṇa sections dealing with the agnihotra is that AB. and ŚāṅkhB. have their continuation or annex in their sūtras, whereas the agnihotra section of JB. is isolated. It can neither base itself on a sūtra nor is there any sūtra which refers to the brāhmaṇa treatment of the agnihotra. The fact that JŚS. prescribes the sāmans to be sung at the agnihotra (see Section 39-41, n. 28) only proves that the Jaiminīyas performed the agnihotra (themselves or through a priest). It does not give any indication of the age and originality of the present agnihotra section. On the contrary. One would expect to find at least a slight reference in a Sāmavedic brāhmaṇa to the use of the few sāmans which may be sung in that ritual. A similar strange phenomenon is the lack of any sāman in the section on the funeral rites which was inserted in this agnihotra portion. The gṛhyasūtra explicitly mentions the sāmans in its (younger) treatment of this ritual.

Definite conclusions on the relation between JB. 1, 1-65 and the framework of the brāhmaṇa can only be made after the other portions have been studied and an analysis of linguistic peculiarities (and differences) is made. Points of contact with other passages within the brāhmaṇas itself are found in Section 9-10, n. 1 (1, 294); 11, n. 4 (3, 377); 17-18, n. 5 (2, 18; more original?) and 42-44, n. 3 (2, 160). The introduction to 53-54 refers to the fact that JB. 2, 41 has a different *skanna-prāyaścitti* which may imply that the agni-

hotra-prāyaścittis of JB. 1, 51-65 (mainly borrowed from ŚB.) are younger. For agreements with JUB. (which is probably younger) see Section 3-4, n. 2 and the introduction of 17-18.

Within the Sāmavedic branch one may also notice a short agnihotra passage in ṢaḍvB. See Section 3-4 on its relation to JB. (which appears to be more original). Section 45-46 refers to a younger ChU. parallel (*pañcāgnividyā*) which partly seems to be influenced by JB. The introduction to 46-49 leads to the conclusion that the *pātracayanam* in the funeral rites may be based on ŚB. and influenced by LŚS. (whereas DŚS. and GPiS. are younger). The relation between JB. and the Śātyāyana Brāhmaṇa is most important for the chronology of the agnihotra section (which itself hardly forms a unity). Caland's conclusion after a long discussion in "Over en uit het JB.", p. 5-12 runs "Perhaps the original Śātyāyanaka, which is lost to us, was taken over by the Jaiminīyas, either a part or the whole of it and amplified with other passages" (Introduction to his translation of PB., p. XVIII). If indeed JB. represents a later redaction of ŚātB., the agnihotra part may have been added at the time when the old brāhmaṇa was worked over into the present JB. (if not still later). There are, however, a few Śātyāyana quotations which refer to JB. 1, 1-65. See e.g. 46-49, n. 11. The description of the funeral rites looks like a sūtra rather than a brāhmaṇa; moreover the term Śātyāyanakam may refer to a sūtra. Ghosh, *Lost Brāhmaṇas*, p. 99 (fragment 58) mentions a reference to the Śātyāyanakam in a pitṛmedhasūtra which cannot be traced in JB. 1, 46-49. BhārGS. 3, 18 (cf. ĀgnGS. 2, 9) explicitly refers to the Śātyāyanibrāhmaṇa, but the quotation *yā evāgnihotre devatās tā aupāsane, ya evāhitāgner dharmah sā eva dharmo ya evāhitāgner lokah sa evaupāsanicasyeti*, which is not found in JB., hardly looks brāhmaṇa-like. If it should belong to a brāhmaṇa, this cannot be the very old ŚātB. assumed by Caland and others. One expects rather a gṛhyasūtra or a comparatively late text such as ŚB. which also has some connection with the gṛhya ritual. The same reference to the Śātyāyanibrāhmaṇa is found in a small Śātyāyanasūtra dealing with prāyaścittis. See Caland, *Versl. Meded. Kon. Akad. v. Wetensch. Afd. Letterk.* Vijfde Reeks IV (1920), p. 475 f., who observes that this sūtra (of which a transliterated copy is found in Utrecht University Library) is affiliated to the Taittiriya. Two other Śātyāyana quotations mentioned by Ghosh in his *Lost Brāhmaṇas* are actually found in the present agnihotra section. See 17-18, n. 36 and 36-38, n. 36. Because of the uncertain-

ty about the Śāṭyāyana quotations and about the identity of the Śāṭyāyanakam and in view of the fact that the old sources quote almost exclusively from the ŚāṭB. (one would expect references to JB. in cases where this text does not agree with ŚāṭB.), I am not inclined to attach too much importance to these correspondences. They do not at least imply that the agnihotra section as found in JB. is old and may be connected with an ancient Sāmavedic brāhmaṇa prior to JB. and PB. Some portions make a comparatively young impression (see the introduction to 39–41). The position of this section within the Sāmavedic literature does not seem to be a very old one.

A comparison with the other texts leads to the same conclusion. On its relation to an older passage from ŚāṅkhB. see 5–6. On the other hand Sections 17–18 and 45–46/49–50 (the verse *vicaḥṣaṇād*) show that JB. 1, 1–65 is previous to KauṣU. See also 46–49 (introd.) on mantras in ŚŚS. which may be partly based on JB. The *vaiśvadev*am passage of Section 21 may be younger than its parallel from AB. In the expiations (51–65) it becomes quite clear that AB. is older than JB. (and ŚB.). JB. 1, 65 seems to have borrowed directly from AB.

On connections with the Taittirīyas see the introduction to 46–49 (the mantra *ayam vai tvad* . .) and 5–6, n. 3 (a verse from TS.). The expiations show that JB. did not only borrow from ŚB., but sometimes also from the source of ŚB., TB. itself (see the introduction to 51–65). The sūtras of Āpastamba and others may have been influenced by JB. (39–41, n. 13 and 17). See also the introduction to 46–49 on the *pātracayanam* of BPiS. The relation to the brāhmaṇa-like portions of VādhS. (the so-called *anvāḥyānas*) is problematic. See Section 7–8 and 26–38, n. 34 on parallels which do not give a clue. In Section 21 JB. seems to be based on VādhS., whereas 19–20 has a parallel in VādhS. which looks like a secondary adaptation of the version of JB. (and ŚB.). These old portions of VādhS. seem to belong to the same period as JB. 1, 1–65 and its ŚB. parallels. See also the end of the introduction to 58–59.

Most agreements are to be found with ŚB. The whole section dealing with the expiations (see the introduction to 51–65) has directly been borrowed from this text (with some exceptions). The same may be said of 19–20. The ŚB. parallel of Section 11 may also be older. The situation in 42–44 is less clear (see n. 2 for a refutation of Caland's argument that the passage of JB. should be more original).

BĀU. (*pañcāgnividyā*) is definitely younger (see 45–46). For connections between JB. and KŚS. see 5–6; 21; 46–49, n. 22. The *pātracayanam* of the Vājasaneyins as first described in ŚB. seems to be followed by JB. with some adaptations (see the introduction to 46–49).

Allowing for some exceptions due to interpolations the chronology or sequence of the agnihotra sections in the Vedic prose seems to be as follows: KS. (= KapS.)–MS. (almost identical with KS.)–TB.–AB. (see, however, 5–6 for an incidental reverse sequence)–ŚāṅkhB.–ŚB.–JB.–ṢaḍvB.–GB. The position of VādhS. seems to be near to ŚB. and JB. A detailed discussion of the relation between the mentioned agnihotra sections in the saṃhitās and brāhmaṇas may be reserved for another occasion. We will not discuss the evident connection between the agnihotra and its grhya counterpart. The grhyasūtra passages dealing with this rite are obviously younger than the corresponding passages in the śrautasūtras. This does not imply that the agnihotra originally could not have been performed with one (grhya) fire. On the original stage of the rite information is lacking.

E. The composition of JB. 1, 1–65

As was mentioned above, the arrangement in sections is already a form of analysis. The following central subjects are found in JB. 1, 1–65. a) A long passage dealing with the expiations (51–65); b) The funeral rites (46–49); c) Eschatology (beginning of 46, end of 49 and 50; 18). On the one hand this forms an annex of the *pañcāgnividyā* (45), on the other hand it is connected with the description of the cremation (49). The latter passage was combined in 18 with an esoteric interpretation of the agnihotra which means offering the sacrificer's second self in the sun (17–18). d) A starting-point for the prāṇāgnihotra, placed at the beginning of the text because it also deals with the agnyādhāna (1–2); f) A myth on the origin of the rite (3–4); g) The right time for its performance (5–6); h) Esoteric interpretations of the rite (7–18); i) Two brahmodyas, one dealing with the cosmic symbolism and to be connected with the preceding sections 7–18 (22–25), the other referring to the *adhyātman* interpretation and forming, like 1–2, a starting-point for a substitute of the actual agnihotra (19–20); j) Mystic interpretation of the first twelve days during which the agnihotra is performed (26–38); k) The

agnihotra ritual (39-41); l) The story of Bhṛgu which offers a justification of the agnihotra; m) A *pañcāgnividyā* passage in which the original relation to the agnihotra was lost and the main stress falls on its eschatological annex (45 and the beginning of 46). The two-fold eschatological passage (preparing the later *devayāna* and *pitṛyāna* passages of the upaniṣads), which had to start from the cremation, seems to have brought about the insertion of the sūtra-like passage on the funeral rites. For obvious reasons the expiations close the whole section. There is a rather systematical structure in the arrangement of this agnihotra portion. This need not imply that this section was composed at once in the present form. Besides the insertion of 46-49 one may note the double treatment of the verse *vicakṣaṇād* and its context in 50 and 18. See also Sections 1-2 and 46-49 (n. 17) on the double occurrence of a small passage.

F. Notes of a more general philological interest

At the end of this work an extensive Index of Sanskrit terms and a General Index (dealing also with *Agnihotra* and *Prāṇāgnihotra*) will be added. It may be useful here to draw attention to some very elaborate or important notes.

SECTION

- 1-2, n. 4 *bhasman*- "product of combustion, digestion, churning, boring, erosion etc." [3. 10]
 5-6, n. 3 The verse *dvau samudrau* . . . (TS. 3, 2, 2, 1) [5. 3]
 n. 13 *dyumna*- and the cosmogony according to JB. 3, 361 [5. 17]
 9-10; n. 8 *dham*- in the blacksmith's workshop [6. 35]
 n. 9 *nyaṅgaḥ pāpmā* an appositional combination (cf. 58-59, n. 1 on *pāpman*- and *avṛtti*- or *ārti*-) [7. 1]
 12-14, n. 6 Reaching a god's *priyam dhāma* sometimes means "catching his fancy" [7. 31]
 n. 12 The formula VS. 20, 13 (ŚB. 12, 8, 3, 31) *lomāni prayatiḥ* . . and the parallel *hṛdayam pretiḥ* . . (JB.). [8. 4]

- 17-18, n. 14 The separate ascent to heaven of body and *asu* or *prāṇa* [9. 10 f.]
 21, n. 5 *sthānu*- "obstacle (especially for chariots); stumbling-block; also metaphorically used". [11. 9]
 22-25, n. 10 *ativad*- "to overpower, overtrump (not only in the debate)" [11. 25]
 n. 11 Taking the initiative in the debate a tactical manoeuvre (especially of *kṣatriyas*) [11. 25]
 n. 17 (genitive +) *iva prakāśo bhavati* and the interpretation of *iva* [12. 3]
 n. 20 *arka* (in combination with *aśvamedha*) denoting the fire [12. 31 ff.]
 22-25, n. 22 *upās*- not primarily meaning "to identify" or "to worship" [13. 10]
 26-38, n. 1 *pratyāśa*- "the being eaten in return" *pratyapacayati* "to put off, buy off" [13. 17]
 n. 8 (*idam*) *sakṛt sarvam* [14. 2]
 n. 26 The symbolism of the *anuṣṭubh* and the *Viśve Devāḥ* as the element which surpasses, summarizes and encompasses the entities of a fixed series which it concludes [14. 28 f.]
 39-41, n. 2 The formula (*su*)*bhūtakṛtaḥ stha* [16. 17]
 n. 23 *devajanāḥ* and other *-janāḥ* groups represent the "rest of the gods", the "other gods", who receive the remains of the oblation. [17. 14]
 42-44, n. 18 *tūṣṇīm ās*- meaning "to remain silent" [17. 33]
 45-46/
 49-50, n. 15 *pravṛj*- with a non-ritualistic meaning [20. 13]
 n. 18 *sa yathā*, other combinations with the so-called "expletive" *sa*, and their origin [20. 16]
 46-49, n. 2 *subhūmi*- as a *karmadhāraya* and as a *bahuvrīhi* [20. 17]
 n. 15 *anvārabdhā*- and the meaning of the *contactus* in funeral rites [20. 30]
 n. 23 *abhyutpūrayati* meaning "to cover com-

- pletely, suffuse" (?) [21. 6]
 n. 27 The killing of a victim [21. 9 f.]
 51-52, n. 2 *jarāmūrīya-* and *jarāmarya-* [22. 12]
 n. 18 *rotsyati* future of *rudh-* "to be deprived of" [22. 31 f.]
 53-54, n. 7 *sarva**prāyaścitti-* and the meaning of *sarva-* [23. 16]
 n. 8 (*idam*) *sarvam* and expressions like (*anena*) *sarveṇa prāyaścittim kurute* [23. 16]
 n. 11 *pratyutthā-* in the context of hostilities [23. 31]
 56
 (last §), n. 2 *sthā-* with the locative meaning "to rely on" [24. 33]
 58-59 (introd.) *pratikhya-* just as *pratidṛś-* means "to foresee" and not "to announce" [25. 17]
 n. 5 *apakram-* "to be lost" [25. 25]
 n. 7 *adas* referring to place as well as time and in a comparison to the non-ritual sphere, daily life, the other occasion (situated in past, present or future) [25. 27]
 60 (introd.) *vyutkram-* "to disperse" (especially in connection with demons) [26. 6]
 61, n. 2 The stock pattern of discussions between brāhmaṇa texts on ritualistic details [26. 16 ff.]
 61, n. 3 *avavraścam* a gerund [26. 19]
 n. 5 *abhivimanth-* replacing a more original *abhivimath-* [26. 19 f.]
 n. 18 *abhitorātram* "before and after the night" [27. 4]
 62-63, n. 5 *anumantrayate* "to call back, lure back" (cf. *upamantrayate*) [27. 19]
 64-65, n. 7 *juhvāsyā-* "whose mouth is with a tongue/flame/ladle" [28. 27]

JAIMINĪYA BRĀHMAṆA

I, 1-65

The connection between these three subjects is explained in *Agnihotra and Prāṇāgnihotra* (abbreviated as *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*), ch. III. For the identity of the fires and the vital powers, of the oblation and food see o.c., ch. III and IV. Part of the passage on the cremation occurs also JB. 1, 47 in the purely ritualistic, sūtra-like description of the funeral rites. In the present context the mantra *asmād vai tvam* . . . excellently establishes the connection between the agnyādhāna and the cremation. The relationship between these two is also found ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 1 ff. and VādhS. 3, 4 (*A.O.* 4, p. 8). The corresponding passage in 1, 47 seems to be less original and may have been taken from 1, 2. The last sentence of 1, 47 hardly fits the ritualistic context and is more suitable in 1, 1-2, where the *adhyātmam* interpretation of the agnihotra is given. The (actually performed) agnihotra is viewed as an *ātmayajña* in accordance with the interpretation of that term by ŚB. 11, 2, 6, 13, where *sa ṛṇmayo yajurmayaḥ sāmamaya āhutamayaḥ svargaṁ lokam abhisambhavati* forms a striking parallel of JB. 1, 2 so *'ta āhutamayo manomayaḥ prāṇamayaḥ (..) ṛṇmayo yajurmayaḥ sāmamayo brahmanamayo hiraṇmayo 'mṛtas sambhavati*. On this concept of *ātmayajña* in which not some external gods, but the sacrificer's self (the internal deity or deities) forms the object of the rite see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. IX, n. 35 ff.

1. Here now they say: "What does he offer, in what there is offered?". He offers life, in (the) life(breath)¹ there is offered. In that here they churn out the fires, thereby they produce the sacrificer's lifebreaths.² Therefore he holds his breath during the churning out.³ His lifebreaths are all that time in the two pieces of kindling wood.

While it (the lower piece of kindling wood) is churned (by the upper *araṇi*) some borings come off.⁴ This is his food that is produced. "Here my food has been produced" thus he should consider it. Thereupon smoke whirls up.⁵ This is his mind⁶ that is produced. "Here my mind has been produced" thus he should consider it. Then (a glowing spot of) charcoal is engendered (in the lower *araṇi*). This is his sight that is produced. "Here my sight has been produced" thus he should consider it. This charcoal swallows those borings. As a child right after its birth reaches out for the breast, so it creeps about in all directions.⁷ This is his hearing⁸ that is produced. "Here my hearing has been produced" thus he should consider it. He (the priest) shakes some grassblades (as a fan) over the fire. This⁹ is his

breath that is produced. "Here⁹ my breath has been produced" thus he should consider it. (The fire) flames up making the sound *bhāḥ*. This is his speech¹⁰ that is produced. "Here my speech has been produced" thus he should consider it.

He produces for himself these five lifebreaths. Having threefoldly¹¹ divided them and having made them divine powers¹² he keeps offering in them (for the rest of his life). Gods indeed are his divine (vital) powers (*devāḥ*).¹³ These are *devāḥ* for him because he keeps offering in (and to) them.¹³

2. Now, as to what they say: "What does he offer, in what there is offered?" (the answer should be that) he offers life¹⁴ and in (the) life(breath) there is offered. It is therefore food which he offers in the lifebreath. He does not die against his will¹⁵ for he strengthens these lifebreaths by offering in them.¹⁶ Moreover the oblation is the brahmin's Ego.¹⁷ This he places in his own body, in these immortal lifebreaths. This being placed in his own body does not perish.

Now when¹⁸ the mind passes away, when the breath, sight, hearing, then it enters these fires. Thereupon they throw after (these lifebreaths) also this body of his in these fires (reciting) "From him thou wert born, he should be born out of thee, *svāhā*".¹⁹ He (arises) from this (fire)²⁰ and becomes immortal in the form of an oblation, mind, breath, sight, hearing, speech, *ṛc*, *yajus*, *sāman*, *brahman* and gold.²¹ His lifebreaths become immortal. He makes for himself an immortal body here (i.e. in the agnyādhāna and agnihotra ritual). He becomes immortal who knowing thus offers the agnihotra.

NOTES

¹ Here *prāṇa* seems to denote the totality of the *prāṇāḥ*. On the several significations of *prāṇa* and *prāṇāḥ* see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. III. I translate the plural with "breaths", when the series *prāṇa*, *apāna* etc. is meant, and with "lifebreaths" or "vital powers", when *prāṇa* occurs together with *vāc*, *manas* etc. These lifebreaths, named after the one that is taken as the most essential, are sometimes misinterpreted as senses, organs of sense etc. It is true that the *prāṇāḥ* may denote the orifices of the head, but mostly the powers behind these together with other vital powers are meant. See also O. H. de A. Wijesekara, "Upaniṣadic terms for sense-functions", *Univ. Ceylon Review* 2 (nov. 1944). The lifebreaths are vital powers or manifestations of life within the body which distinguish living beings from the dead and from unanimated objects. Mostly the agnyādhāna symbolizes the laying of the other series of *prāṇāḥ* in the sacrificer's self, but here the churning out of the fire is described as producing the five lifebreaths, which at the end of this chapter are said to be identical to the three sacred fires. So offering in the established fires means offering in the *prāṇāḥ* or in the *prāṇa* as the totality

of the lifebreaths. On this *adhyātmam* approach of the actually performed agnihotra and its connection with the *prāṇāgnihotra* see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.* (especially ch. III).

² According to ŚB. 2, 2, 2, 14 f. the churned fire is the sacrificer's breath. By breathing upon it he confirms the identity of breath and fire (and kindles it). Thereupon he inhales the fire and places it in his self. According to Ewing, "The Hindu conception of the functions of breath", *J.A.O.S.* 22, p. 285 f., he first inhales and then breathes out. This is untenable as is in general his interpretation of *prāṇa* as the inbreathing. KŚS. 4, 8, 26 f. stating *tasyābhiśvāsah prāṇam amṛte dadha iti/ucchvāso 'mṛtaṃ prāṇe ādadha iti* proves Eggeling's interpretation to be correct. JB. deals with the lifebreaths and not with the breaths. But in the next sentence, where reference is made to holding the breath, we may find a relic of the more current equation of fires and breaths.

³ The sacrificer holds his breath in order to symbolize the absence of breath or life before the production of the fire. The *manthana* gives him a new life. He is born at the agnyādhāna (MS. 1, 6, 4). Notice, however, that the practical aspect may also play a role: *ato yāny anyāni vīryavanti karmāṇi yathā gner manthanam ajeḥ saraṇam dṛḍhasya dhanuṣa āyamanam aprāṇann anapānaṃ tāni karoti* (ChU. 1, 3, 5).

⁴ This sentence has been misunderstood by Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 121 (see also his "JB. Roots and Verb-Forms", *Journal of Vedic Studies* 1935, p. 90): "Of this (fire) as it is being churned out the ashes fall down". Raghu Vira & Lokesh Chandra "Studies in the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa", *A.O.* 22, p. 56 follow this translation. The following objections can be raised towards such an interpretation. First one has to supply "fire", which indeed was mentioned three sentences before but there it occurred in the plural. Moreover ashes are the product of combustion rather than of churning fire. In the following context a very detailed description is given of the process of inflammation. First *bhasma* falls off, thereupon (*anu*) smoke comes forth, thereupon (*anu*) glowing charcoal. This glowing charcoal is nourished by the *bhasmāni* and after being fanned produces a fire. How could *bhasma* in this context mean ashes? What we need here is "borings (bore-dust)", the product of the erosive churning in the lower *araṇi* which is inflamed by the glowing wood of that *araṇi* (the *aṅgārāḥ* as the text calls it). The *Petr. Dict.* and Monier-Williams do not support my rendering of *bhasma*, but compare Caland's translation "faeces" (JB. 1, 127; JB. *Auswahl*, p. 32) which, though likewise without parallels from the dictionaries, is the only possible interpretation in the context. Mayrhofer, *Etym. Wörterb. d. Altind.* II, p. 490 does not accept the connection with *bhas-* "to chew, consume", but adopts the dubious explanation proposed by Thieme, *Festschrift Schubring*, p. 8, who derives *bhasman-* from *bhas-* "to blow" and supposes that *bhasma* is the place on which one blows in order to poke up the fire at daybreak. From this basic meaning the signification "ashes" would have developed. Mayrhofer, however, agrees that "die konkurrierende Verbindung mit *bhas-* 'kauen' könnte allenfalls für sich in Anspruch nehmen, dass zu dieser Sippe einige Wörter für 'Sand, Staub' [~'Äsche?'] gehören". See also Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, p. 35 f. The derivation from *bhas-* "to chew, consume" easily explains every shade of meaning of *bhasma* as "product of demolition": ashes, faeces, borings, dust, etc. are products of combustion, digestion, churning or boring, erosion etc. For *bhasma* as the erosion produced by rivers on the mountains see Rām. (Bombay ed.) 2, 63, 19 [= crit. ed. II, p. 339 crit. app.]: *pāndurāruṇavarnāni srotāṃsi vimalyāny api susruvur giridhātu-*

bhyaḥ sabhasmāni bhujamgavat. The meaning "dust" also occurs in compounds (*bhasmatūlam* "shower of dust"; *bhasmameha* "a sort of gravel"). The sacred ashes used in the ritual mostly are not the product of combustion, but are taken from cowdung. See Mrs. Hélène Brunner-Lachaux, *Somaśambhupaddhati* I (Pondichéry 1963), p. 30 f. (mentioning a popular etymology of *bhasma* beside the accepted one). Perhaps this cowdung is called *bhasma* as being pulverized rather than as being a product of digestion (as in JB. 1, 127). For *bhasma* meaning "dust" or "powder" compare also the derivatives in R. L. Turner, *A Compar. Dict. of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, Fasc. VII (Oxford 1965), p. 537 (i.e. referring to Kashmiri *bas* "fine dust or powder (of charcoal, fuel, cowdung, & c.)"). See also *P.T.S. Pali-English Dict.* s.v. *bhasman*.

⁵ If the text reading *ninardati* ("to slur or trill" referring to chanting of *sāmans*) is sound, the auditive impression is transferred here to a visual impression (trilling of smoke). There are no parallels, but the *Petr. Dict.* mentions the meaning "to move" (lexic.).

⁶ Mostly *manas* is connected with the moon, sometimes (e.g. ChU. 3, 13) also with rain (*parjanya*). The identification in this passage with smoke has to be explained in the context of the water doctrine (see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. VI B), which teaches that out of the smoke of the sacrificial (or funeral) fire rain is produced in heaven and sent down every half-month by the moon. So smoke, moon and rain belong together.

⁷ The glowing charcoal (i.e. that spot in the lower *arāṇi* where the wood starts glowing as a result of the friction) creeps about in all directions (*tiryāṇ visarpati*), i.e. it spreads "eating" the borings around that spot. The *tertium comparationis* is not the creeping, but the eating, the first action of a child and a newly produced fire.

⁸ Hearing (*śrotam*) is frequently equated with the quarters. The creeping about in all directions (*vi sarpati*), i.e. the spatial extension (the quarters represent space as the seasons represent time in Vedic India), is compared to hearing.

⁹ I.e. the wind produced by the fanning. Wind and *prāṇa* are usually identified. The pronouns *sa* and *eṣa* (*prāṇa evāsyā s a jāyate | prāṇo ma eṣo 'jani*) indicate that indeed a subject like wind should be referred to and that *tad* and *etad* in the preceding sentences are not adverbial, but are congruent with the neuter nouns *annam*, *manas* etc. (whereas *tai* is an adverb in *tad yad etad agnīn manthanti ... tat prāṇān janayanti*).

¹⁰ Speech and fire form a current equation. For *bhāḥ* cf. JB. 1, 294 (*JB. Auswahl*, p. 118) *sā* (sc. the cow) *bārhatīm vācam vadati bhā itī*.

¹¹ For the connection between three lifebreaths or vital powers (and not breaths) with the three sacrificial fires compare VādhS. 3, 1 (*A.O.* 4, p. 6 f.).

¹² The vital powers are sometimes called *devāḥ*. See O. H. de A. Wijesekara, whose view (o.c., p. 15) that "With the growing tendency in the Upaniṣads to regard *manas* as one of the sense-functions, in fact as the sense-function *par excellence*, the term *deva* is extended by analogy to apply to other cognitive and conative senses in the human body" lays too much stress on the sense-functions of the *prāṇāḥ* and on *manas*. The life-aspect seems to be more important (*prāṇa* does not always represent smell among the vital powers). Moreover *prāṇa*, already very early a central conception, did not need the analogy of *manas* to be called divine. As life-potencies these *prāṇāḥ* are immortal, are gods. Being gods they receive the oblations as deities. One offers (by way of the fires with whom they are homologized) in or rather to the *prāṇāḥ*, the internal deities.

¹³ The external gods are replaced by internal gods. This sacrificer is no longer a *devayājīn*, but an *ātmayājīn*. The self of the sacrificer becomes the object of the rite (see on the *ātmayājīna* interpretation of the actually performed śrauta sacrifice ŚB. 11, 2, 6, 13). Moreover this final sentence of 1, 1 seems to explain why the vital powers are called *devāḥ*. One offers symbolically in or to the *prāṇāḥ*. According to ŚB. 9, 4, 2, 15 one makes someone a deity (*devatā*) by an oblation.

¹⁴ In the first chapter the offering in the *prāṇa* has been explained. The second chapter deals with the offering of *prāṇa*. In fact food is offered in *prāṇa*, but since the effect of this food-offering (actually the agnihotra oblation) means that life is maintained and strengthened, one may say that life (*prāṇa*) is offered; that life is added to life. So food means life, a not unusual identification. Cf. ŚB. 2, 2, 2, 1, 6: "He takes out (material for an oblation) to Agni Pavamāna (the Blowing). Now the blowing one is breath, so that he thereby puts breath into him (the sacrificer). And this he puts into him by means of this (offering); for breath means food and this offering also is food" (tr. Eggeling). Cf. also ŚāṅkhB. 25, 13: "The repetition of *o* is food; the breaths are food; the Śilpas are the breaths; verily thus he places the breath in the breaths" (tr. Keith).

¹⁵ Read *'nakāmāmāra imān ...* (ms. ra *nakāmāmāra imān...*) instead of *'nnaṃ kāmāyamāna imān ...* For *anakāmāmāra* (Monier-Williams: "not killing undesiredly"; but cf. Schmidt's *Nachträge* on the concise *Petr. Dict.*: "deutlicher: vor unerwünschtem Tode schützend") see AĀ. 2, 3, 8; KhādGS. 4, 1, 18 (19) and especially GobhGS. 4, 6, 1 (ed. Cintamani Bhattacharya, Calcutta 1936) with Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa's bhāṣya, which clearly shows that the compound refers to the not dying against one's will. For the general idea cf. also ŚāṅkhĀ. 11, 6 *mā 'ham akāmo marīṣāmy annavān annādo bhūyāsam svāhā*, where the ritualism reminds us of the *prāṇāgnihotra* and of the agnihotra speculations as found in our text.

¹⁶ This conception of the strengthening of the *prāṇāḥ* is also current in the *prāṇāgnihotra*.

¹⁷ I read with ms. la³ *svaṃ yad* instead of *svaṛ yad*. Whitney's transcript reads *svaryard* with v.l. *svamryard*. Veda Vyasa's specimen pages have *svaṛ yad*. The manuscript of this specimen edition, sent to Caland as enclosures of a letter dated 9 aug. 1928, contains Caland's correction *svaṃ* for *svaṛ* (which indeed hardly makes sense in the context). Perhaps, however, *svaṃ* here does not mean "Ego", but "property, wealth".

¹⁸ From here to the end of this chapter cf. Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 19, p. 106 n. 7.

¹⁹ The same formula (*asmād vai tvam ajāyathā eṣa tvay jāyatām svāhā*) is found JB. 1, 47 and with some slight differences KauśS. 81, 30; ĀsvGS. 4, 3, 27. Cf. also VS. 35, 22; ŚB. 12, 5, 2, 15; TĀ. 6, 1, 24; 6, 2, 3; 6, 4, 12; KŚS. 25, 7, 38; ŚSS. 4, 14, 36. The fire which was produced by the sacrificer at the agnyādhāna should now in turn cause the sacrificer to be born in heaven. See the introd. to this section.

²⁰ Presumably *ataḥ* here means "therefrom, from the fire(s) in which he is cremated". In the parallel passage of 1, 47 *ataḥ* can hardly have this meaning, as the immediate context does not refer to the actual cremation. For the whole sentence cf. AB. 1, 22, 15; JB. 3, 340; ŚB. 4, 3, 4, 5; 10, 5, 1, 5; 11, 2, 6, 13. See also ŚB. 12, 5, 2, 13 (funeral ritual) *tām vā etām | yajamānātmāhutam antato juhōti sa yo 'sya sarge loko jito bhavati tata āhutamayo 'mṛtaḥ sambhavati* (JB. so 'ta āhutamayo ... 'mṛtas sambhavati).

²¹ For *hiraṇmaya*- cf. AĀ. 2, 1, 3; ŚB. 10, 1, 4, 9. Gold symbolizes immortality.

3-4. *The agnihotra a reduced great sacrifice.*
Equation of the agnihotra with soma sacrifices

After the section on the agnyādhāna which forms the foundation of the agnihotra the text continues with a myth on the origin of the rite in which, as usual, Prajāpati plays a role. Prajāpati's thousand-year *sattra* is ultimately reduced to the one-day agnihotra by the gods. For this passage cf. ŚaṅvB. 4, 2 (ed. Sharma 5, 2) *prajāpatir vā etat sattram sahasrasamvatsaram asrjata* (JB. *prajāpatis sahasrasamvatsaram āsta*). In the ŚaṅvB. passage, which looks like an abridged version, Prajāpati reduces this sacrifice successively to the *gavāmayana*, *dvādaśāha*, *atirātra*, *ṣoḍaśin*, *ukthya*, *agniṣṭoma*, *iṣṭi* and *paśubandha* and ultimately to the *agnihotra* (*teṣāṃ prajāpatih sahasrasamvatsaram gavāmayane 'vārundhat | gavāmayanam dvādaśāhe . .*) without any explanation of the motive of this abridgement, whereas in JB. the gods themselves reduce the thousand-year sacrifice as being too long for human beings. In ŚaṅvB. *teṣāṃ* should refer to the gods according to the commentary, but in the direct context no gods are mentioned. ŚaṅvB. 4, 1, 5 *teṣāṃ prajāpatih sadyoyajñasamsthām upaiti* should, however, presumably be connected with 4, 2 (the one-day sacrifice being the agnihotra). One might be under the impression that the composition of the agnihotra section is corrupt. The expiations of ŚaṅvB. 4, 1, 7-8 have no relation with the agnihotra, as was already observed by Eelsingh in his introduction to the ŚaṅvB. ed. (thesis Utrecht 1908), p. XXI; XXX; XXXII. Moreover 4, 1, 16 *sarvair ha vā etasya yajñakratubhir iṣṭam bhavati | ya evaṃ vidvān agnihotram juhōti* is repeated at the end of 4, 2, 1. Probably this sentence originally should only conclude the equations of the agnihotra with other great sacrifices (4, 1, 6; 4, 1, 9-11; 4, 1, 15). The repetition after the Prajāpati myth may be an indication that the original position of these equations was after the myth which explains the agnihotra as the essence of all sacrifices. This original situation is indeed found in JB., where strikingly the very systematical identification of agnihotra and other sacrifices (1, 4) is concluded with (*yad ete sāyam | prātārāhuti juhōty etābhyāṃ evāsyaḥkṛtibhyāṃ*) *sarvair etair yajñakratubhir iṣṭam bhavati*. The original text of ŚaṅvB. reconstructed so far should be 4, 1, 5; 4, 2, 1; 4, 1, 6; 4, 1, 9-11; 4, 1, 15-16. The paragraphs before 4, 1, 5 deal with the coming into being of the Puruṣa, which is identified with sacrifice (the same sacrifice which is reduced to the agnihotra?). ŚaṅvB. 4, 1, 3 and JB. 1, 3 show a striking resemblance

ŚaṅvB. (*te devāḥ prajāpatim upādhāvan*) *veda śarīrair vā idam*
 JB. (*te 'bruvan*) *deva śarīrair vā idam*
 ŚaṅvB. *amṛtaśarīr am na ha vā idam mṛtyoḥ*
 JB. *amṛtaśarīr aiś samāpāma na vā idam manuṣyās*
 ŚaṅvB. *samāpsy ateti (a iti)*
 JB. *samāpsy anti*

Bollée's translation: "The gods resorted to Prajāpati thinking: this body of "immortality" (or: immortal body) shall not together with the bodies of the Vedas (, the fires,) be reached by death" reproduces the interpretation of the commentary (whose value is low; see Eelsingh, o.c., p. XXXI ff.) rather than the brāhmaṇa itself. E.g. *samāpsyata* cannot be correct. The translation does not take account of the double *idam*. The wrong interpretation (or rather the corruption of the text) forces the commentary to take the next sentence (*te 'bruvan ko nāmāsi*) as meaning *sa puruṣaḥ konāmakaḥ khalv āsety evaṃ prajāpatim abruvan* and Bollée does so without observing that he has departed from the printed text. It may be assumed that ŚaṅvB. 4, 1, 3 up to *samāpsyateti* forms a corrupt insertion. ŚaṅvB. 4, 1, 2 describes how the Puruṣa came into being as a result of the austerities practised by the gods. Directly after 4, 1, 2 the question of the gods (to that Puruṣa and not to Prajāpati) *ko nāmāsi* should follow. The corruption of the sentence which forms the parallel of JB. 1, 3 may be the result of an attempt to make the insertion agree with its new context (in which the Vedas indeed play a role). The original version of *mṛtyoḥ* may have been *martyāḥ*, which might imply that JB. (reading *manuṣyās*) was not the source.

ŚaṅvB. seems to combine a myth on the origin of sacrifice (the Puruṣa is *yajña*) with the reduction of the primeval sacrifice to the agnihotra (i.e. a myth on the origin of this rite) in order to emphasize the importance of the agnihotra as the essence of the very first sacrifice. For equations of the agnihotra with other, impressive sacrifices as found in JB. 1, 4 and in the ŚaṅvB. parallel see also JB. 1, 38; 1, 40; AB. 5, 28; ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 17 ff.; TB. 2, 1, 5, 1 ff.; 2, 3, 7; etc.

3. Prajāpati performed a sacrificial session of a thousand years. Having completed seven hundred years he gained that victory which is his here.¹ Ascending to the heavenly world he spoke to the gods: "Bring ye to an end those (remaining) three hundred years". "So be it" (they said). Having completed the three hundred years they gained the same as Prajāpati had gained. They all together, this one, that one and the other one,² had only as much power as Prajāpati (alone). They said: "We have brought this (sacrifice) to an end with our divine, immortal bodies; forsooth the human beings will not complete this.³ Come, let us contract⁴ this sacrifice". They contracted it to the year-sacrifice.⁵ They said: "This is something great. Let us contract it". They contracted it to the twelve-day session. They said: "This is something great. Let us contract it". They contracted it to the *prṣṭhya* six-day. They said: "This is something great. Let us contract it".

4. They contracted it to the *trirātra*, the *dvirātra*, the *āptoryāma*, the *atirātra*, the *vājapeya*, the *ṣoḍaśin*, the *ukthya*, the *agniṣṭoma*, the

iṣṭi and the *paśurbandha*, the *caturmāsyas*, the full and new moon sacrifices and the two (daily) agnihotra libations. Further than this (agnihotra) it was not subdued. Therefore the agnihotra is unsurpassed. Not overcome is he who knows thus.

When⁶ he⁷ touches water⁸ before (offering the oblation) — water is truth, the *dīkṣā* is truth⁹ — then that is his *dīkṣā*¹⁰. "Agni is the light, the light is Agni, *svāhā*", with this eight-syllabic¹¹ formula he offers the oblation. Of eight syllables is the *gāyatrī*. That is the morning libation of soma.¹² He offers the second oblation reciting only in thought.¹³ That is the midday libation of soma. He wipes off¹⁴ (the spoon) and eats. That is the third libation. For that third libation is licked at as it were.¹⁵ After (the offering of the oblation) he touches water.¹⁶ That is his *avabhr̥tha*.¹⁷ When he offers these two evening oblations, because of these two oblations a performance is made by him of all those sacrifices.¹⁸ And when he offers these two morning oblations, because of these two oblations a performance is made by him of all those sacrifices. Therefore this agnihotra is unlimited.¹⁹

NOTES

¹ *imām eva jītim ajayaḥ yāsyeyam jītiḥ tām*. ŚB. has in such cases (e.g. 5, 2, 3, 7) *eteno eva vyajayata yāsyeyam vijītiḥ tām*. See on this apodosis with *tām* Minard, *Trois Enigmes* II, § 833 a. See also Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 211 f.

² For *ta ete sarve eva prajāpatiṃ mātṛā ayāzṃ ayāzṃ iti* (thus should be read, see Raghu Vira & Lokesh Chandra, *Studies in JB.*) cf. JUB. 1, 2, 1, 12, translated by Oertel "All these are just commensurate with Prajāpati, [of whom one may doubt:] 'Is it this one? Is it this one?'" Presumably *-mātṛāḥ* indicates that the gods did not individually obtain the same result, but had to share the same portion together. The *iti* after *ayāzṃ ayāzṃ* ("this one, that one") may stand for "etc." in an uncompleted enumeration. The preceding sentence ... *tām u eva jītim ajayan yām prajāpatir ajayat* is likewise identical in both texts. In the JUB. passage Prajāpati (who wishes with regard to the gods *imām vāva te jītim jeṣyanti ye 'yam mama*) presses out the three Vedas. There is a very remote resemblance with the mentioned ṢaḍvB. parallel, but the agreement with JB. in these two sentences is striking.

³ Cf. ŚB. 12, 3, 3, 5 for a substitution of the thousand-year sacrifice on behalf of man: "for what man is equal thereto that he could get through with (a performance of) a thousand years?" (tr. Eggeling). See also GB. 1, 5, 10. The thousand-year sacrifice is not reduced to the agnihotra by ŚB., but there may be some relation with the agnihotra as treated ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 1 (stating that the agnihotras enter upon a long sacrificial session). The JB. parallel (1, 51) is not preceded in the same way by a passage on long sacrificial sessions. An indication that JB. has borrowed?

⁴ Note the use of *sam-bhṛ-* with the meaning "to concentrate, contract, reduce". Are there any parallels? According to Monier-Williams *sambhṛta-*

at least may signify "concentrated", but one is under the impression that *sam-bhṛ-* mostly means "to concentrate, accumulate, collect" rather than "to concentrate, contract, condense".

⁶ ṢaḍvB. 4, 2 calling the *saṃvatsara* (year-sacrifice) *gavāmayana* leaves out *pr̥sthya śaḍaha, trivātra, divātra, āptoryāma, vājapeya*, the *caturmāsyas* and the full and new moon sacrifices in its reduction of the *sahasrasaṃvatsara*.

⁷ From here to the end of this chapter the author glorifies the agnihotra by equating it with the soma ritual. See the introduction to this section. The reverse takes place VādhS. 4, 39 (A.O. 6, p. 151), where the soma ritual is equated with the agnihotra.

⁸ Presumably the sacrificer and not the *adhvaryu* is the subject. The *dīkṣā* would seem to refer to the sacrificer rather than to the officiant. See n. 8 and 16. Moreover, sometimes one performs the agnihotra oneself.

⁹ According to ĀpŚS. 6, 9, 3; HirŚS. 3, 7, 63 and ĀśvŚS. 2, 3, 16 the officiant touches water (*apa upaspr̥ṣya*) (before offering the libation) with the mantra *vidyud asi vidya me pāpmānam ṛtāt satyam upaimi (mayi śraddhā)* (TB. 3, 10, 9, 2). The same formula is recited by the sacrificer who sips water (*apa ācāmati*) while sitting behind the āhavanīya at the beginning of the rite (ĀpŚS. 6, 5, 3; cf. ŚSS. 2, 7, 18 and KŚS. 4, 15, 4). Remarkably BhārŚS. 6, 1, 5 (presumably referring to the sacrificer in the same situation) reads *vidyud asi (...) iti hoṣyann apa upaspr̥ṣet*. "In this manner, in all sacrifices, he should touch water when he is going to perform a sacrifice and also after having performed it" (BhārŚS. 6, 1, 7; tr. Kashikar; cf. ĀpŚS. 4, 1, 7). So *apa upaspr̥ṣati* either refers to the sacrificer who is his own priest and touches water before offering the oblation, or (more probably) to the yajamāna who sips water at the beginning of the ceremony. The ācamana formula of KŚS. 4, 15, 4 *vr̥ṣtir asi vr̥ṣca me pāpmānam satyena vratam upaimy āpaḥ satyam mayi vratam* perfectly suits the equation with the *dīkṣā*. The mantra is also used in the (prāṇāgnihotra) *bhojanavidhi*.

¹⁰ For the identification of water and truth see e.g. KŚS. 4, 15, 4 *āpaḥ satyam* (n. 8 above). According to Naigh. 1, 12 *satyam* is *udāham*. For *dīkṣā* and truth cf. AB, 1, 6, 6 *ṛtam vāva dīkṣā satyam dīkṣā tasmād dīkṣitena satyam eva vaditavyam*.

¹¹ ṢaḍvB. 4, 1, 6 differently homologizes an action from the agnihotra ritual with the *dīkṣā*: *yad gārhapatyam prāduṣkaroti sā dīkṣaṇīyā*.

¹² Eight-syllabic because *svāhā* is not counted (Oertel, "JB. Roots and Verb-forms", J.V.S. 2, p. 71).

¹³ At the morning pressing *gāyatrī* verses are sung. Cf. JB. 1, 288.

¹⁴ Here *manasā niṣkevalyena* contains an allusion to the *niṣkevalya śastra* which is recited at the midday pressing.

¹⁵ For *upamr̥ṣte* cf. ŚB. 12, 5, 1, 12. JB. 1, 41 and the sūtras have the active form *upamr̥ṣti*. One may assume that *upamr̥ṣte* is not asyndetically connected with *prāśnāti*, but forms an absolute locative with omitted subject (see Oertel, *Syntax*, p. 297 f.).

¹⁶ *lehitam iva*. The third pressing is sucked out as it were (*dhītam iva*) according to JB. 1, 156 (Caland, *Auswahl*, p. 56); 1, 288 (Caland, o.c., p. 114); 3, 295. For further parallels see Ghosh, *Lost Brāhmaṇas*, p. 53. See also ŚB. 4, 3, 3, 19.

¹⁷ Cf. n. 8. The officiant touches water with the formula *vr̥ṣtir asi vr̥ṣca me pāpmānam ṛtāt satyam upāgām* (ĀpŚS. 6, 11, 4; ĀśvŚS. 2, 3, 23 reading *apsu śraddhā* instead of *ṛtāt* ... etc.). The same mantra (with *apsu śraddhā* added) is recited by the sacrificer who sips water (ĀpŚS. 6, 14, 6). See also BhārŚS. 6, 1, 6, where the sacrificer seems to touch water with this

formula. That *apa upaspr̥ṣati* here in the identification with the *avabhṛtha* should refer to the sacrificer who sips water appears from KŚS. 4, 15, 5 *vācam visr̥jya punar ācāmati vidyud asi vi me pāpmānam jahy apo 'vabhṛtham abhy upaimi mayi satyam goṣu me vratam iti*; ŚSS. 2, 12, 12 *satyenā-vabhṛtham abhyavaimy apsu vratam iti ācamya vācam visr̥jate*.

¹⁷ See the preceding note. BŚS. 3, 7, 7 quoting TB. 2, 1, 4, 9 mentions another kind of *avabhṛtha*, viz. the pouring out of water. ŚaḍvB. 4, 1, 10 and VādhS. 3, 25 (A.O. 4, p. 25) homologize the sacrificer's cleansing (*mārjayate*) with the *avabhṛtha*.

¹⁸ Cf. ŚaḍvB. 4, 1, 16; 4, 2, 1 *sarvair ha vā etasya yajñakratubhir iṣṭam bhavati ya evam vidvān agnihotram juhōti*. Bollée's rendering of *sarvair* ("With complete sacrificial rites . .") is not correct. Cf. MS. 1, 8, 6: 124.18 f. *agnihotre vai sarve yajñakrataṣaḥ sarvān yajñakratūn avarunddhe ya evam vidvān agnihotram juhōti*.

¹⁹ JB. 3, 357 *sarvam ha vā idam anyat paryantavat ete ha vā aparyante yad ahorātre*. Night and day like the two performances of the agnihotra have no limitation. They always continue their alternation. Therefore the agnihotra ceremony does not have an official conclusion: *saṁ evānye yajñās tiṣṭhante 'gnihotram eva na saṁtiṣṭhate 'pi dvādaśasamvatsaram antavad evāthaitad evānantam* (ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 13); *na barhīr anupraharet. asaṁsthito vā eṣa yajñah yad agnihotram. yad anupraharet yajñam vicchindyāt* (cf. MS. 1, 8, 7: 126.8 ff. criticizing KS. 6, 8: 58.9 ff. on this *anupraharaṇa*).

5-6. The right time for the performance of the agnihotra

This subject is found in almost every agnihotra section. KS. 6, 5: 54. 4 f. (cf. KapS. 4, 4) and MS. 1, 8, 7: 125. 9 simply state that one should offer about the time of sunset and sunrise. The later texts are involved in a discussion on the question as to whether one should offer before or after sunrise. TB. 2, 1, 2, 7 observes *yad anudite sūrye prātar juhuyāt ubhayaṁ evāgneyam syāt*. AB. 5, 29-31 seems to elaborate this point and strongly advocates the performance after sunrise. TB. 2, 1, 2, 12 (an interpolation?) rejects the own view of 2, 1, 2, 7 and especially AB.'s. The final conclusion (one should offer *auśasam*) on the one hand forms a compromise and on the other hand fairly agrees with the view of the older Yajurvedins (KS. *upodayam*; MS. *vyuṣṭāyām*). Cf. VādhS. 2, 10 (A.O. 2, p. 149) dealing with the *anvādhāna* of the fires: *śvo bhūte* is rejected (*yathānāgātāyātīthyam kuryād*); *udite* is likewise rejected (*yathātī-tāyātīthyam kuryād*); conclusion: *viraśmav āditye*. The second (interpolated?) view of TB. seems to be later than AB. One may compare ŚāṅkhB. which first observes *sa ya udite juhōti pravāsata evaitan mahate devāyātīthyam karoti. atha yo 'nudite juhōti saṁnihitāyaivaitan mahate devāyātīthyam karoti. tasmād anudite hotavyam* (2, 9; ed. Sarma 2, 8, 1-4). Thereupon it continues with an obviously later version of the discussion which is found in AB. (see Keith, *Rig-Veda Brahmanas*, p. 355 in a note on ŚāṅkhB. 2, 9) and in which the offering before sunrise is criticized. The ultimate conclusion (*saṁdhau juhuyāt*) agrees with the compromise of TB. and JB. The image of night and day as two oceans and as Śyāma and Śabala is found in JB. as well as in ŚāṅkhB. Presumably ŚāṅkhB., in which Kauṣītaki is quoted as an authority (prescribing *sāyam astam ite purā tamasas tasmin kāle juhuyāt*; cf. JB. 1, 6 *astam ite purā tamisrāyai*), is the source. ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 2 ff. favours the offering after sunset and before sunrise with the well-known arguments: *sa yat sāyam astam ite (prātar anudite) juhōti ya idam tasminn iha sati juhavānīti (yah . . juhavāni = qui sacrificem = ut ego sacrificem*; see Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 26, p. 112 f.); *tasmād uditahominām vicchinnam agnihotram manyāmaha iti ha smāhsurir yathā śūnyam āvasatham āhared evam tad* (2, 3, 1, 9). The fact that ŚB. does not mention the counter-arguments against offering before sunrise and consequently does not arrive at the compromise of TB., ŚāṅkhB. and JB. might suggest that it belongs to an earlier phase. The very elaborate argumentation in defence of the own point of view (offering before sunrise) may, however, imply a refutation of the counter-argument (AB.) and therefore make the compromise superfluous. Finally I would refer to the old VādhS. 3, 26 (A.O. 4, p. 26 f.) which observes that some offer the evening and morning agnihotra *ahna eva rūpe* (presumably they offer after sunrise and before sunset) and others *rātriyā eva rūpe* (after sunset and before sunrise), whereas the agnihotra should be *ahorātrayor . . rūpam* (the argument

of AB.). VādhS. 3, 27 (o.c., p. 27) calls the moments of offering *anvasta-mita āditye* and *purodetoḥ* Prajāpati's world named Vibhān. Cf. JB. 1, 6 on Prajāpati's *dyumnaḥ*. The sūtras seem to make the time of offering optional. KŚS. 4, 15, 13 (dealing with the *paśukāma*) probably is based on JB. 1, 5.

5. If one is desirous of possessing cattle one should offer the agnihotra in the evening after the arrival of all the cattle.¹ Now the agnihotra is *brahman*. With *brahman* he thereby encompasses the cattle. At daybreak (he should offer) before the cows are let loose.¹ Now the agnihotra is *brahman*. With *brahman* he thereby encompasses the cattle. He encompasses these cows on both sides with *brahman*. He obtains cattle. He becomes rich in cattle.

If one is desirous of heaven (one should take the following mantra into consideration:)² "Two impassable, wide, large oceans come and go in a revolving, alternating movement like two footprints on a path".³ Night and day are the two impassable oceans.⁴ Those who offer by night enter the night-ocean⁵ and those who offer after sunrise the day-ocean.⁵ There is⁶ an opportunity to cross⁷ these two as if there would be a ford⁸ (?) or a connecting causeway⁹ (viz. the moment) when the sun has set,¹⁰ but before darkness (and the moment) when it lights up¹⁰, but before sunrise.¹¹

6. Night and day are also those two (dogs) Śyāma and Śabala.¹² Śabala is the day, Śyāma the night. Those who offer by night fall into the hands of the Night-Śyāma and those who offer after sunrise of the Day-Śabala. The opportunity to pass these two is the same (viz. the moment) when the sun has set, but before darkness (and the moment) when it lights up, but before sunrise.

Moreover the appearance of light¹³ at these (moments)¹⁴ is Savitr.¹⁵ Savitr is Prajāpati¹⁶ and Prajāpati all the gods.¹⁷ Thus there is offered by him to¹⁸ Prajāpati, to all the gods. That is why this agnihotra is sacred to Prajāpati.¹⁹ When here at daybreak it becomes light, in this very appearance of light Prajāpati generated the creatures. Savitr is Prajāpati, Prajāpati is identical with all the gods. Thus there is offered by him to Prajāpati, to all the gods. That is why this agnihotra is sacred to all the gods.²⁰

Moreover night and day meet here (at the moment of the evening-agnihotra) facing this point (*evammukham*).²¹ The agnihotra is food. Thus he places nourishment before the mouth (*mukhataḥ*)²² of night and day. In the same way they meet again at dawn. The agnihotra

is food. Having thus placed nourishment before the mouth of night and day he escapes from those two repeated dyings which are night and day.²³

NOTES

¹ KŚS. 4, 15, 13 *antah paśau paśukāmasya sāyamprataḥ*. Cf. MS. 4, 2, 11: 34. 17 *prātar evāntaragoṣṭhāsu goṣu hotavyam*.

² From here to the end of this chapter see Caland, *Auswahl*, § 1. The mantra is rather abruptly introduced. The text may be corrupt here.

³ The verse occurs with some differences at TS. 3, 2, 1 (Caland and the crit. ed. quote 3, 2, 8, 1): *dvau samudrau vitatāu ajuryau paryāvariete jathareva pādāḥ tayoh paśyanto atiyanty anyam apaśyantaḥ setunātiyanty anyam*. Keith translates: "Two oceans are there extended, unperishing; they revolve in turns like the waves in the bosom of the sea; seeing they pass over one of them seeing not they pass over the other with a bridge". JB. has only the first half of this mantra. According to Keith the bridge with which one of the oceans is crossed is "sleep pictured perhaps as a ship". If sleep is meant here, it is either pictured as a bridge, or as a ship, and not as both at the same time. Caland observes in a note on his translation of ĀpŚS. 12, 18, 17, where the verse is used in the same ritual context, that "Der Damm ist das Agnihotra (?)". This does not seem to be correct since the *setu* is placed in the night-ocean and not between the two oceans. The verse also occurs BŚS. 14, 7: 163. 9 ff and 26, 7: 281. 8 ff. (where it is explained and Keith's view on the *setu* is confirmed). VādhS. 4, 102 (A.O. 6, p. 222 f.) comments upon the verse in an *anvākhyaṇa* on the *cayana*. It explains *paryāvariete* of the mantra by *paryāvarivartete* (cf. JB. version *āvarivartete*). Unfortunately it does not comment on *jathare* 'va pādāḥ, which is presumably corrupt. According to VādhS. the bridge (*setu*) is *prāṇa*. The three sūtras adopt the TS. version of the mantra without any changes, whereas JB. differs on the following points: *acaryau* for *ajuryau*; *mahāntāu*; *āvarivartete* for *paryāvariete*; *caryeva* (v.l. *patheva*) for *jathareva*; *pāḍau* (v.l. *padau*) for *pādāḥ*. The reading *acaryau* is not suitable in the context of the complete TS. mantra, where the oceans can be passed even without seeing (*apaśyantaḥ*). Therefore JB. apparently has changed the mantra and adapted it to its own purposes. The idea that night and day are one or two impassable oceans was current in connection with the agnihotra. See Ghosh, *Lost Brāhmaṇas*, p. 113 giving a quotation from the Śailāli Brāhmaṇa by Āpastamba: *samudro vā eṣa yad ahorātras, tasyaite gādhe tirthē yat sandhī, tasmāt sandhau hotavyam* (ĀpŚS. 6, 4, 7). Cf. also ŚāṅkhB. 2, 9 (ed. Sarma 2, 8, 17 ff.) *samudro ha vā eṣa sarvaṃ haro yad ahorātre. tasya gādhe tirthē yat sandhye. tad yathā gādhabhyām tīrthābhyām samudram atīyāt tādṛk tat, yat sandhau juhōti*. Evidently *mahāntāu* is superfluous (perhaps a gloss on *vitatāu*) and spoils the metre (a tristubh in which *dvau* has to be read twosyllabic and *vitatāu* should precede *acaryau* as in the TS. version). TS. *paryāvariete* forms an excellent pāda-beginning, whereas JB. *āvarivartete* looks like an explanation of *paryāvariete* (cf. VādhS. *paryāvarivartete*). The dual *pāḍau* or *padau* refers to two walking feet or two footprints which alternately return like day and night. Comparing RV. 3, 55, 15 where night and day are likewise two footprints I propose to read *padau* and (with one ms.) *patheva* ("as on a path") instead of *caryeva*. So we may conclude that JB. has taken a half-verse from TS., (perhaps) made prose of it, changed the meaning on some points and produced a sentence which makes sense.

⁴ The image of night and day as two oceans is already present in the TS. version of the mantra, where, however, the passing between the two is not mentioned at all. The two oceans may represent high and low tide which alternate like night and day. Presumably JB. has combined the concept of the two alternating oceans from TS. with the description of the one impassable ocean from ŚāṅkhB. and ŚailāliB. (see n. 3) which has two tirthas.

⁵ Instead of *ahar eva samudraḥ* the classical Sanskrit would use a karma-dhāraya compound.

⁶ Oertel, *Syntax*, p. 157 takes *asti* as a copula. Caland, *Auswahl*, § 1 and § 2 translates here and in the parallel sentence of 1, 6 (where *asti* should be supplied) "es gibt". See Oertel, o.c., p. 184 on JB. 1, 6. Minard, *Trois Énigmes*, II, § 456 reads *tayor etad evātyayanam* (which is also the reading of JB. 1, 6 in the crit. ed.) instead of *tayor vā etayor atyayanam*. He seems to have overlooked that *etad eva* at 1, 6 refers back ("the same") to 1, 5, where the text need not be wholly identical.

⁷ Oertel's translation "the (place for) crossing" (o.c., p. 157) is quite possible, since *atyayanam* seems to be on a level with *saṃkramaṇam* (see n. 9).

⁸ Veda Vyasa (*Specimen pages*, p. 8) reading *caiṣavam* instead of *vaiṣavam* observes that "Caland suggests *vaiṣamyam* but the manuscript evidence does not support the assumption of any conjunct consonant in the third syllable. F has *caiṣavam* (*ca* + *aiṣavam*) which I have accepted. I think *aiṣavam* (derivative from *iṣu*) is to be taken with *saṃkramaṇam*. My view is supported by the occurrence of *vā* twice". Caland rightly remarks in the margin of the manuscript that *ca* is not possible in the context. On account of the well-known combination *yathā vai* one may perhaps assume here a corrupt reading *yathā vai *ṣavam* or **ṣacam*. On the other hand one may also derive *vaiṣava-* from *viṣu-* (adv. "in both directions, on both sides") like *vaiṣṇava-* from *viṣṇu* (a suggestion which I owe to Prof. Gonda) and regard *vaiṣava-* as something which connects both sides.

⁹ Caland translates *setor vā saṃkramaṇam* by "... oder das Betreten eines Dammes". This does not seem to be correct since *saṃkramaṇam* is on a level with *vaiṣavam*, which, whatever its exact meaning may be, at least does not express an action. Therefore *saṃkramaṇam* should be interpreted differently. Cf. ŚB. 13, 2, 10, 1 where *setu* and *saṃkramaṇam* are almost synonymous ("a passing across, a bridge" tr. Eggeling). The genitive *setor* is explicative: a connection consisting of a causeway, i.e. a connecting causeway.

¹⁰ *astam ite* and *svyuyṣṭāyām* are hypostatized locatives (Oertel, *Syntax*, p. 157).

¹¹ JB. *svyuyṣṭāyām purodayāt* agrees with MS. 1, 8, 7: 125. 9 *vyuṣṭāyām*, but there is a long discussion in the intervening period (see the introduction to this section). In *vyuṣṭāyām* the subject to be supplied is night. See Oertel, *Syntax*, p. 183 where several passages in which *vyuṣṭāyām* occurs together with *anudīte* (*ādīte*) and *purā sūryasyodetoḥ* are quoted. Interesting in connection with the present passage is PB. 12, 6, 8 *etad vai na naktam na divā yad vyuṣṭāyām anudīta ādīte*.

¹² Cf. ŚāṅkhB. 2, 9 (ed. Sarma 2, 9, 7 ff.), presumably the source of JB. (see introd. of this section). On the two dogs see Bloomfield, *J.A.O.S.* 15 (1893), p. 163 ff.

¹³ With some hesitation I render *dyumnāḥ* by "appearance of light". The Petr. Dict. and Monier-Williams do not mention the masc. form, but it sometimes occurs (e.g. Simon's Index on KS. refers to 5, 2). An interesting parallel for the meaning required here is found JB. 3, 361 (*Auswahl*, § 212) in

the difficult and corrupt passage dealing with the cosmogony of the golden egg: *tac* (sc. the egg) *chataṃ devasaṃvatsarāṇ chayitvā nīrbhīdyam abhavat sahasraṃ vā; dyumnā ha nāma tapyāsū; yāvān eṣa saṃvatsaras, tāvāntaḥ saṃvatsarasya pratimā; dyumnair ha sma saṃvatsaram vijānanti; atha ha tataḥ purāhorātre saṃśliṣṭe evāsatur avyākṛte; te u agnihotreṇaiva vyākṛte* (Caland's text and punctuation). The crit. ed. using some new mss. reads: ... *sahasraṃ vā dyumnān. dyumnā ha nāma tarhy apy āsūḥ* ... The new text, which does not seem to be an improvement in all respects, is translated as follows by K. Hoffmann, "Die Weltentstehung nach dem Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa", *M.S.S.* 27, p. 65: "Es wurde reif zum Aufspringen, nachdem es hundert Götterjahre dagelegen hatte oder tausend Dyumnas — Die sogenannten Dyumnas gab es damals auch noch. Wie gross das Jahr ist, so gross waren die Abbilder des Jahres. Mit den Dyumnas pflegte man das Jahr zu unterscheiden. Vordem waren Tag und Nacht zusammenhängend, nicht gesondert. Erst durch das Agnihotra wurden sie gesondert". What we miss in the sentence *dyumnā ha nāma tarhy apy āsūḥ* is a negation. In this cosmogony the most important fact is that nothing at all existed in the beginning. There was no difference between day and night; consequently the concept of time or at least the division of time in years was absent. One can only reckon by years if one has three hundred and sixty-five days, i.e. if one has a differentiation of day and night (which only exists since the coming into existence of the agnihotra and presumably of the *dyumnas*). On this situation in the beginning see RV. 10, 129 and especially the parallel passage ŚB. 11, 1, 6, 1 ff., which states *ajāto ha tarhi saṃvatsara āsa and nāha tarhi kā cana pratīhāsa*. I propose to read ... *sahasraṃ vā. dyumnā nāha nāma tarhy apy āsūḥ*, a simple emendation in which *dyumnān* (missing in Caland's ms.) is deleted before *dyumnā(nāha)* and one omitted syllable *nā* (haplology!) is inserted. My interpretation of the passage is: "Having lain for hundred divine years it was ready to break. Or was it for thousand divine years? For there were no appearances of light (= no sunrises) at all in that time (and consequently chronology did not exist). As old as this year that we know (*eṣa saṃvatsaraḥ* as distinct from the divine years, which for that matter can only be counted if there is a criterion like sunrises for measuring time), so old are the reflections of this year (e.g. the nights and days; see KS. 7, 15: 79.5 f.; TB. 1, 1, 6, 7: twelve nights the reflection of the year; ŚaṅvB. 3, 12: nine days; ŚāṅkhB. 17, 5 (ed. Sarma 17, 4, 17): *etāvān vai saṃvatsaro yad ahorātre*). One distinguishes the years by the appearances of light (for without sunrises there are no days, the *pratimāḥ* of the year, and without these *pratimāḥ* there is no year). Before that time (in the timeless, eternal period before the breaking of the egg) night and day (who are differentiated by the *dyumnāḥ*, the sunrises) were contiguous and undifferentiated. They were differentiated by the agnihotra" (I will elsewhere discuss some *crucis* of this text, e.g. the lack of concord in *tāvāntas*). The moments between night and day are called *prajāpater vibhān* ("differentiating light"?) *nāma lokāḥ* at VādhS. 3, 27 (*A.O.* 4, p. 27), which prescribing this moment for the agnihotra performance moreover states: *vyavahāram hy enayor* (sc. night and day) *eṣā devatā udeti vyavahāram anvastameti*.

¹⁴ One of the mss. and Veda Vyasa read *haiṣa* instead of *haiṣu*. Does *eṣu* refer to the moments when the agnihotra is performed?

¹⁵ That Savitr is the light before sunrise appears from JUB. 4, 5, 1 *vyuṣi savitā bhavasy udeṣyan viṣṇur* ...

¹⁶ For this identification see ŚB. 12, 3, 5, 1; PB. 16, 5, 17; GB. 2, 5, 22. Cf. also TB. 1, 6, 4, 1 *prajāpatiḥ savitā bhūtvā prajā asṛjata*.

¹⁷ Sometimes *viśve devāḥ* refers to all the gods, sometimes to a special category, the All-gods. See Renou, *E.V.P.* 4, p. 1 ff. on these gods. TB. 3, 3, 7, 3 equates Prajāpati with *sarvā devatāḥ*, whereas according to ŚB. 6, 3, 1, 17 the *viśve devāḥ* are his sons.

¹⁸ Here *juhōti* with loc. means "to offer to" and not "to offer in(to)". Cf. the end of 1, 8. In the agnihotra speculations which form a starting-point for the *prāṇāgnihotra juhōti* with loc. (the fires = *prāṇāḥ*) means "to offer in", but at the same time it implies "to offer to". Monier-Williams does not mention this use of *juhōti* with loc.

¹⁹ Cf. ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 1 *prajāpatyam agnihotram*. See VādhS. 3, 27 (*A.O.* 4, p. 27) on Prajāpati's connection with the right moment for the performance of the agnihotra.

²⁰ Cf. TB. 2, 1, 4, 6 *brahmavādīno vadanti kimdevatyam agnihotram iti vaiśvadevam iti brūyāt*. Presumably there is no reference to the All-gods, but to all the gods. Cf. AB. 5, 26, 5 ff. calling the agnihotra which is sixteenfoldly equated with gods *vaiśvadeva*.

²¹ Veda Vyasa reads *eva mukham*, but *evammukham* of the crit. ed. (a compound with adverbial meaning) is preferable since *samdhataḥ* though active means "to meet". Cf. ŚB. 10, 5, 4, 2.

²² Probably *mukhataḥ* here means "before the mouth" (*mukha* denoting "face, direction" as well as "mouth"). Cf., however, ŚāṅkhB. 2, 1 (2, 1, 7) *mukhata eva tad ahorātre prīṇāti*, where *mukhataḥ* means "at the beginning".

²³ Compare the end of 1, 13. On *ahorātre*, besides which *ahorātrau* is found in other texts as well as JB., see Lokesh Chandra, *Gavāmayana*, p. 51, n. 5 (on JB. 2, 29) and Thieme, *Gaṅganātha Jhā Comm. Vol.* (Poona 1937), p. 416 ff.

7-8. Interpretation of the agnihotra. The sun, which at the end of the day sixfoldly spreads, is reintegrated and generated by the agnihotrini

Here starts a series of mystic interpretations of the agnihotra which are concluded by the stock phrase *ya evam vidvān agnihotram juhōti* (JB. 1, 8; 9; 10; 11; 14; 16 etc.). The main theme of this section, viz. the desintegration of the sun at sunset and its reintegration through the agnihotra, has a close parallel in VādhS. 3, 24 (*A.O.* 4, p. 24 f.). Compare also ŚaḍvB. 4, 6, 2 f. (during the waning part of the month the moon enters herbs, forest-trees, cattle, sun, brahman and brahmins and is reintegrated by the brahmins in the *sāmnāyā*-libation). The version of JB. (translated in Caland's *Auswahl*, § 3) misses the entrance of the sun in the earth (remarkably the passage on the reintegration from the earth is corrupt in VādhS.) and combines the theme of the sun which is gathered again with the well-known generation of the sun which has passed the night as an embryo. In this respect it may be less original. It tries (without much success) to solve the problem of the twofold agnihotra (evening and morning) which does not suit the single reintegration. The evening agnihotra means the impregnation of the sun, the morning ceremony its delivery. The superfluous reintegration at daybreak in fact is not made more acceptable. On this twofold aspect of impregnation and delivery (which in this section also implies deliverance from sin) in the agnihotra see also KS. 6, 5: 54. 5 ff. (*agnir eva pravāpayitvā sūryam rātryai garbham dadhāti . . prātaḥ prajānayatya etam vai prajāyamānam prajā anu prajāyante*); MS. 1, 8, 5: 121. 6 f. (*agnēyā sāyamāhutis tayā retah siñcati. tad retah siktam rātryai garbham dadhāti*); ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 3 ff. *atha yad astam eti, tad agnāv eva yonau garbho bhutvā praviśati . . ; atha yat prātar anudite juhōti, prajānayatya evainam etat . . ; tad etasyaivānu prajātim imāḥ sarvāḥ prajā anu prajāyante . . ; cf. KS.*

7. Yonder sun goes asunder in six parts¹ when it sets. "It has gone asunder"² the ancients who were acquainted with traditional legends used to say of it, but now (one says:) "it has gone down". When it sets it enters the brahmin with faith, cattle with milk, the fire with glow, the plants with sap,³ the waters with juice,³ the trees with pith.⁴

When the brahmin⁵ cleanses the vessels that are used in the agnihotra ritual and when he is occupied⁶ with them he thereby collects in it (sc. the sun) the faith with which it has entered him. And when they milk the milk (used for the agnihotra) he thereby collects in it the milk with which it has entered the cows. And when he pokes up the charcoals he thereby collects in it the glow with which it has

entered the fire. And when he holds a burning grassblade over the milk he thereby collects in it the sap with which it has entered the plants. And when he pours water on (the boiled milk) he thereby collects in it the juice with which it has entered the waters. And when he lays a firewood on the fire he thereby collects in it the pith with which it has entered the trees.

8. Having thus collected it he offers it⁷ in the evening. It passes that night in the condition of an embryo. Having again collected it in the same way he offers it at dawn. He causes it to be born. Right at its birth it drives away all evil for him. The gods were born from Prajāpati. This one (the sun) is also born from him who knows thus. He wins a "world"⁸ that is as large as the one Prajāpati has won.

Moreover it thinks: "This one certainly collects me properly⁹. Well, let him reach old age sound in life and limb,¹⁰ unbroken." And it also thinks: "This one certainly knows me properly. Well, let me enter him". It enters him who knows thus.

It is the sole hero¹¹ who shines here, it is Indra,¹² it is Prajāpati.¹³ To him therefore is offered by the one who knowing thus offers the agnihotra.

NOTES

¹ VādhS. 3, 24 (A.O. 4, p. 24) makes the sun enter into seven beings or elements (the six of JB. and the earth).

² *vyamrucad*. Since only *nimrocati* is found elsewhere, *vimrocati* seems to have been created for this occasion. On the special initial and final position of *vyamrucad* and *nyamrucad* underlining the contrast see Gonda, *Stylistic Repetition in the Veda* (Amsterdam Academy 1959), p. 115 f.

³ Here *ūrj* is connected with plants and *rasa* with water, whereas JB. 3, 358 (explaining why the sun is called *āditya*: *tad yad eteṣāṃ bhūtānām ādatta tad ādityasyādityatvam*) observes that *sa* (sc. the sun) ... *ādatte* ... *ūrjam apām rasam oṣadhīnām*.

⁴ On *svadhā* representing "la caractéristique essentielle de l'espèce 'arbre'" see Varenne, *La Mahā Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad* I, p. 151 in a note on MNU. 208 (dealing with *svadhiti*).

⁵ Here the version of VādhS. has *atha yad brāhmaṇo juhōti tad u haivainam brahmaṇa 'dhi sambharati*. JB. starts with the brahmin, VādhS. concludes with his performance of the offering. The correspondence is more perfect in the rest of the passage.

⁶ *pariceṣṭati*. Veda Vyasa follows Caland in accepting *pariceṣṭati*, but supposes that the correct reading may be *pariveveṣṭi*. He refers to AB. 1, 17, 5; TB. 2, 1, 2, 12 and ŚB. 1, 3, 1, 2. The last mentioned place (*atha patrāṇi nirnenijati tair nirniṣya pariveveṣati*), though at first sight interesting, is not a real parallel, since it relates to the serving of food in a non-ritual sphere. Presumably *pariceṣṭati* should be retained. It may refer to the arranging of the sacrificial implements to the north of the gārhapatya. Cf. BSS. 3, 4: 72. 16 f. *athaitāny agnihotrapatrāṇi prakṣalitāny uttareṇa gārhapatyam upasādayati*

kūrce vā sūnāyām vā. It should be observed that the text is very systematical in keeping up the chronological order of the ritual in this passage. So *pariceṣṭati* must denote an action which takes place immediately after the cleansing of the vessels.

⁷ Cf. KS. 6, 3: 51. 11 f. *payasāgnihotraṃ juhōti amum eva tad ādityam juhōti*. See also the introduction to this section and *Agn. a Prāñāgn.*, ch. V A and C on the cosmic symbolism of the agnihotra.

⁸ On this conception of winning a "world" see Gonda, *Loka. World and Heaven in the Veda* (Amsterdam Academy 1966), passim and especially p. 37. By creating one god (the sun) one obtains the same space (sphere of influence?) as Prajāpati, the creator of all gods.

⁹ With *anuṣṭhyā* (according to Monier-Williams only meaning "immediately") I hope to deal on another occasion. For my translation compare Egge-ling's rendering "properly" (ŚB. 2, 4, 4, 21) and "in due form" (ŚB. 1, 5, 1, 10). The form occurs also in JB. 1, 53.

¹⁰ At other places *sāṅga* and *satanu* mean "with a body and limbs" when referring to a bodily rebirth in heaven.

¹¹ Elsewhere instead of *eko viraḥ* the compound *ekavira-* is found. Mostly it is an epithet of Indra. Here it denotes the highest god, the Supreme, identical with the sun. According to JUB. 2, 2, 3, 1 the *ekavira* is the *prāṇa*. Remarkably the *ekarṣi* is likewise identified with sun as well as with *prāṇa*. See Gonda, *Savayajñas* (Amsterdam Academy 1965), p. 404.

¹² For the equation of Indra and sun see JUB. 1, 9, 1, 2; 1, 10, 2, 5; ŚB. 1, 6, 4, 18; 2, 3, 4, 12; 3, 4, 2, 15; 4, 5, 5, 7; 4, 5, 9, 4; 4, 6, 7, 11; 8, 5, 3, 2.

¹³ Cf. JB. 2, 370 (*Auswahl* § 160) *atho eṣa vai prajāpatir yo 'sau tapati*; ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 17 *atha yat param bhāḥ prajāpatir vā sa indro vā*. One offers to the supreme god who in his cosmic aspect manifests himself as the sun, but also enters man (presumably as his *prāṇa*, the *ekavira* or *ekarṣi*). Man is identical with the Supreme. The agnihotra as a sacrifice to this highest principle may be compared to the *prāñāgnihotra*.

9-10. *The agnihotra frees the performer from evil*

This section elaborates one sentence from JB. 1, 8: so 'sya jāyamāna eva sarvaṃ pāpmānam apahanti. Originally the deliverance from evil was only connected with the morning agnihotra, in which the sun frees itself from the evil of darkness. By the performance of the agnihotra man is also freed from his evil or sin. See ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 6 "Even as a snake frees itself from its skin, so does it (the sun-child) free itself from the night, from evil: and, verily, whosoever, knowing this, offers the Agnihotra, he frees himself of all evil, even as a snake frees itself from its skin" (tr. Eggeling). The quoted sentence from JB. 1, 8 likewise refers only to the morning agnihotra. This section, however, makes the deliverance apply to both agnihotras by introducing the offering of sun in fire and fire in sun. On this subject see *Agn. a. Prānāgn.*, ch. V A and C.

The sūtras describe the taking out of the fire (*uddharaṇa*) as a taking out of sin. The sacrificer recites: *bhūr bhuvaḥ suvar uddhara pāpmano mā yad avidvān yac ca vidvāṃś cakārāhnā* (resp. *rātryā*) *yad enaḥ kṛtam asti pāpaṃ sarvasmān moddhrto muñca tasmād* (ĀpŚS. 6, 1, 7 and in most other sūtras). No brāhmaṇa mentions these formulas as Caland observes in a note on his translation of Āpastamba. Compare, however, AB. 5, 26, 1 f. *yad evāhnā* (resp. *rātryā*) *sādhu karoti tad eva tat prān uddhṛtya tadbhaye nidhatte*. So both agnihotras are connected with the removal of sin or the safeguarding of good works.

This section was edited by Oertel, "JB. Roots and Verb-Forms", *J.V.S.* 2, p. 88 f. The text of the crit. ed. is identical.

9. The evil that is committed in the day time, of that the sun is the cause. What is committed at night, of that the fire. The two of them said: "If we shall (ever) be thus, we shall not be able to support the creatures. Well, let us be food (and) let us offer ourselves¹ in each other". When the sun sets, it offers itself in the fire.² Whatever evil the sun commits in the day time, that the fire³ drives away for it at night. When the sun rises, the fire rises after it.⁴ It offers itself in the sun. Whatever evil the fire commits at night, that the sun⁵ drives away for it by day. As a snake frees itself from its skin,⁶ as one pulls a rush out of its sheath,⁶ so he frees himself from all evil,⁷ who knowing thus offers the agnihotra.

10. On account of the evening-oblation the fire drives away for him at night the evil that he commits by day. On account of the morning-oblation the sun drives away for him by day the evil that he commits at night. As a snake frees itself from its skin, as one pulls a rush out of its sheath, so he frees himself from all evil. As in gold,

when it has been heated,⁸ no stain, no evil,⁹ at all remains, so there remains no stain, no evil, at all in him who knowing thus offers the agnihotra.

NOTES

¹ *itthaṃ ced vai bhaviṣyāvo na vai tarhi śakṣyāvaḥ prajā bhartum*. Exactly the same statement (made by *brhat* and *rathantara* after discord between *brhat*-animals and *rathantara*-animals had arisen) is found JB. 1, 294.

² See the introduction to this section. Eggeling correctly translates ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 36 "In the evening he offers Sūrya in Agni, and in the morning he offers Agni in Sūrya", but he takes *juhōti* with accusative as "to offer to" in ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 2 *ādityo vai gharmaṣaṃ tām sāyam agnau juhomy agnir vai gharmaṣaṃ prātar āditye juhomi* (cf. ŚāṅkhB. 2, 1 *gharmo vā eṣa pravṛjyate yad agnihotram. tad asau vai gharmaṣaṃ yo 'sau tapati*; see also TB. 2, 1, 3, 2 and KS. 6, 3: 52.9): "... to him I make offering in Agni in the evening ...". For a similar misinterpretation see H. Lefever, *The Vedic Idea of Sin* (Nagercoil 1935), p. 60 translating JB. 1, 23 so 'ham adas satyam asmin satye sāyam juhomiḍaṃ satyam amuṣmin satye prātar juhomi by "In the evenings I offer to satya (fire) in satya (sun) and in the mornings to satya (sun) in satya (fire)". That the sun enters the fire at night appears also from AB. 8, 28, 9; TB. 2, 1, 2, 9; KS. 7, 4: 66. 1 and MS. 1, 5, 5: 73. 11 ff.

³ The fire is *pāpmano 'pahantā* (ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 13) and *sarveṣāṃ pāpmanām apahantā* (ŚB. 7, 3, 2, 16).

⁴ Cf. TB. 2, 1, 2, 10 *udyantaṃ vāvādityam agnir anusamārohati*. See also Caland's translation (with note 3) of ĀpŚS. 4, 1, 8.

⁵ The sun is *pāpmano 'pahantā* according to ŚB. 13, 8, 1, 11. The evil that one commits by day or night is removed by the sun, if one worships the sun thrice a day (KauṣU. 2, 7).

⁶ For these similes see Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 19, p. 122 (in a note on JB. 2, 134) and especially "JB. Roots and Verb-Forms", *J.V.S.* 2, p. 89 (where the correct reference for the simile of the snake skin should be ŚB. 2, 5, 2, 47). See also Ghosh, *Lost Brāhmaṇas*, p. 107 quoting a Jābāli Brāhmaṇa (*yathāhis tvaco nirmucyate, evaṃ sarvasmāt pāpmano nirmucyante*). E. W. Hopkins, "Gods and Saints of the Great Brāhmaṇa", *Trans. Conn. Ac. A. Sc.* 15 (1909), p. 30 refers in his chapter "Morality" to PB. 4, 9, 5 and 9, 8, 8 ("cast off sin as Arbuda the snake casts his skin"). It is, however, doubtful if the dead skin represents sin there. See Sāyaṇa's commentary on 9, 8, 8 (... *ata etābhis stuvānā api mṛtaṃ yajamānam apagamayanti*; he differently comments on 4, 9, 5). Casting off the skin seems to mean overcoming death in PB. See PB. 25, 15, 4: "Through this (rite) the serpents vanquished death. They who perform it vanquish death. Therefore they (the serpents), having left aside their old hide, creep further, for they had vanquished death" (tr. Caland). In fact both sin as well as death are a *pāpman*.

⁷ On the Vedic conception of sin, evil etc. see S. Rohde, *Deliver Us from Evil. Studies on the Vedic Ideas of Salvation* (Lund 1946), who gives an extensive bibliography, but fails to mention H. Hartog, *Zur Frage des frühvedischen Sündenbegriffes. Eine sprach- und religionswissenschaftliche Untersuchung* (thesis Marburg 1939). The latter work discusses the previous treatment of this subject (p. 6-10) and i.a. deals with *pāpman* and *pāpa* (p. 59-66). The difference between *pāpman* (the evil from which man wishes to be delivered here) and *pāpa* (in this passage frequently used for the evil which is

committed) is that *pāpman* "does not as *pāpa* signify an evil work although comprising also this kind of evil. It does not appear with *karoti*, and is not contrasted to *punya*" (Rohde, p. 34 f.).

* *dhmāte* from *dham-* "to blow". The blacksmith blows wind on the fire by means of bellows and thus heats the metal. I doubt if *dham-* means "to (s)melt". Does the purification of metals only imply melting? Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 214 translates: "Just as, when gold is smelted (= refined) ..." (cf. Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, § 680: "fondu"). For the refining of gold he refers to PB. 17, 6, 4 *yathā hiranyam niṣṭaped evam enam* [*yajamānam*] *agniṣṭun niṣṭapati* and JUB. 3, 6, 6 *tad yathā ha vai suvarṇam hiranyam agnau prāsyamānam kalyāṇataram kalyāṇataram bhavati* ... Remarkably Oertel leaves out of account PB. 17, 6, 3 ... *upaivainam tad dhamati*. Caland translates: "... he (the performing priest) thereby blows on him", and observes in a note: "So that all alien substances are removed from him, just as the blacksmith blows on the metal to cleanse it". It is, however, not the blowing itself which purifies the metal, but the heating caused by the blowing. One should not separate PB. 17, 6, 3 from 17, 6, 4 by distinguishing with Sāyana a *loha-kāra* in 3 and a *svarnakāra* in 4. The verb *niṣṭapati* in 4 may be only an explanation of *dhamati* in 3. Compare also JB. 2, 136 (*Auswahl*, § 140) *yathā ha vai niṣkaḥ śamala-grhīta evam sa yo 'nucānaḥ san na virocate*, 'gnā u vā etaṃ prāsyanti yam agniṣṭutā yājayanti, *tad yathā niṣkaḥ śamala-grhītam agnau prāsyā tasyāyoghanena sarvaṃ śamalam nirhanyād evam haivāśya sarvaṃ pāpmānam nirghnanti*. This passage, a parallel of PB. 17, 6, 3-4, makes it clear that neither smelting of ore, nor refining of metal by melting is meant. The gold is heated and then beaten. Apparently *dham-* means "to blow; to blow as a blacksmith, i.e. to heat; to hammer the heated metal in order to refine or model it; to forge". This semantic development has already taken place in RV. See Renou, *E.V.P.* 15, p. 57, whose translation of RV. 10, 81, 3 "il fond ensemble (comme à la forge), de ses deux bras, à l'aide des ailes, le ciel et la terre en (les) créant", however, fails to convince me. In Vedic cosmogony the conception of a fusion of heaven and earth (Geldner uses the verb "zusammenschweissen", "to weld") is not current. RV. 10, 72, 2 (where Geldner likewise translates *sam-dham-* by "zusammenschweissen") even more clearly shows that "forging", i.e. "shaping a material by heating and hammering" rather than "melting" is denoted by *dham-*. The *sat* comes into existence out of the *asat*, not to be taken with Geldner as "aus dem Nichts". The *asat* is the amorphous mass, the undifferentiated "Urmatérie", out of which the Creator forges (shapes) this cosmos with heaven and earth, i.e. the *sat*.

* For *na kaś cana nyanṅaḥ pāpmā pariśiṣyate* compare JUB. 1, 14, 4, 5 (= 3, 6, 9, 7) *sa vidyād .. neha kaś cana pāpmā nyanṅaḥ pariśekṣyate iti. tasmin ha na kaś cana pāpmā nyanṅaḥ pariśiṣyate*; 2, 4, 3, 1 f. *na haiva tatra kaś cana pāpmā nyanṅaḥ pariśiṣyate. sa vidyān neha kaś cana pāpmā nyanṅaḥ pariśekṣyate sarvaṃ evaitā devatāḥ pāpmānam nidhakṣyanti* (by heating the last evils are removed). Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 214 renders *nyanṅaḥ pāpmā* by "a trace (of) badness" and "trace (of) evil" (cf. Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, § 680: "trace de souillure"). The insertion of "of" between two nouns in apposition should, however, be rejected, the more so as the order of the nouns is reversed in the quoted parallels from JUB. Frequently *pāpman-* occurs in apposition to nouns expressing something unfavourable (see also Minard, o.c., § 226b observing that "Pāpman- forme avec nirṛti- un groupe formulaire analogue à Mrtyu Pāpman"). Sometimes *pāpman-* precedes, sometimes it follows. When an equation with *pāpman-* precedes the apposition-

al use, the position of *pāpman-* is strikingly the same in both cases. ŚB. 6, 3, 3, 7 *śramo vai pāpmā ... tasya śramaṃ pāpmānam apāghnanti* against ŚB. 11, 1, 5, 7 *pāpmā vai vṛtro .. pāpmānam vṛtram hanti*. That in these cases *pāpman-* is not an adjective appears from ŚB. 7, 2, 1, 4 *atho ya eva pāpmā yā nirṛtis tam etābhir apahate. tad yad etābhiḥ pāpmānam nirṛtim apahate tasmād ...* Cf. JUB. 4, 8, 3, 10 (*apahatyā mrtyum apahatyā pāpmānam*), where the appositional combination *mrtyuḥ pāpmā* is split up, as we have dissolved *nyanṅaḥ pāpmā* in our translation "no stain, no evil". Sometimes, however, *pāpman-* preceding a noun must be an adjective. Keith translates AĀ. 2, 1, 4 *asya dviṣan pāpmā bhrātṛvyaḥ* by "his enemy, the evil one, who hates him", but the position of *pāpmā* makes it clear that it has to be taken like *dviṣan* as the attribute of *bhrātṛvyaḥ*. Cf. ŚB. 1, 2, 4, 3 *pāpmane dviṣate bhrātṛvyāya ..* "the wicked, spiteful enemy" (Rohde, *Deliver Us*, p. 49). Besides those cases in which the position of *pāpman-* is influenced by a preceding equation, the noun *pāpman-* also comes before its apposition in a "groupe formulaire" as was observed by Minard (o.c., § 226b).

Reverting to *nyanṅaḥ pāpmā* we must conclude that "trace" cannot be the correct translation, of *nyanṅa-*, since "trace" itself does not denote something unfavourable. Now *nyanṅa-* derives from *ni-añj-* "to smear, anoint". So *nyanṅa-* denotes the substance sticking to an object as the result of smearing, often with the implication of dirt or badness. See TB. 3, 2, 10, 2 *sphyaṃ prakṣalayanti medhyatvāya, atho pāpmana eva bhrātṛvyasya nyanṅam chinatti* and especially TB. 3, 7, 6, 20 *triṣṭhalikriyamānānām yo nyanṅo avaśiṣyate rakṣasām bhāgadeyam*, where again *nyanṅa-* is regarded as a residue (*avaśiṣyate*), i.e. in a way as a trace of something, but denotes itself the idea of badness, evil, dirt etc.

II. The agnihotrin is taken to heaven by the rising sun and released
from death

An excellent parallel to this section is found in ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 9, where the agnihotrin places his hands on the sun (= Death) by the evening oblations and his feet on the sun by the morning oblations. The rising sun takes him up and thus he remains beyond the reach of death. In the same context other motifs occurring in this section are found: beyond the sun is immortality, on this side death (ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 7); night and day are on this side of the sun (ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 11). ŚB. does not explicitly mention an elephant in its image of the rising sun, but the same simile as in JB. seems to be meant. Now it is remarkable that ŚB. uses this simile *inter alia* in order to prove that its views on the right time for the performance of the agnihotra are correct. Is this elephant simile in ŚB. (the sun-elephant is still *anudita*- when the morning agnihotra is performed) inspired by AB. 5, 31, 2 which states that by offering after sunrise (i.e. to an elephant with its trunk stretched forth) one is taken to heaven on the elephant's trunk? There is no trace of this discussion in the JB. passage, which consequently may be later than ŚB.

For this section see Caland, *Auswahl*, § 4.

II. Nagarin Jānaśruteya used to say: "The sun here enters its lair¹ viz. the fire, when it sets". By offering the two evening-oblations he gets a foothold on the back of this sun. It is like getting a foothold with both feet.² When now he offers these two morning-oblations, it lifts him up by means of these two. As an elephant rises together with him who is sitting on the elephant-seat, so this deity rises together with him who offers knowing thus.³ It makes him go to its own world of which there is none supreme.⁴ Whatever is beyond the sun, that is immortality.⁵ That he wins. And whatever is on this side of the sun, night and day⁶ carry this away from here, as a whirlwind may carry away.⁷ There are many worlds beyond the sun. All these are reached, are won by him, in all these he has free and unrestrained movement⁸ who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

NOTES

¹ In spite of parallels such as ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 3 *atha yad astam eti tad agnāv eva yonau garbho bhūtvā praviśati* (see also JB. 1, 8 and 9) I doubt if *yonī*- here means "womb" or "birthplace". The context refers to an animal (in JB. explicitly called elephant) which lies down and rises up again the next morning. So *yonī*- here has to be taken as "safe place", "lair".

² Instead of Caland's *ubhayapadī* Raghu Vira reads with all mss. *ubhayā-padī*. Cf. JB. 3, 90 *yathobhayāpadī pratitiṣṭhet tādṛk tat*; JUB. 4, 8, 4, 3 *sa yathobhayāpadī pratitiṣṭhaty evam eva svarge loke pratyaṭiṣṭhan* (Oertel in his notes on p. 243 remarks "*ubhayāpadī*: sc. *devatā*", an untenable interpretation of the case-ending of this word).

³ VādhS. 4, 28 c (A.O. 6, p. 135) likewise compares the rising sun to a rising elephant which carries people on its back to heaven, but in a different context (the right time for undertaking the *dikṣā*).

⁴ Caland reads .. *ya etasyeyataḥ paraṃ nāsti*. In his translation "... der sich jenseits dieses so grossen (Raumes) befindet" the negation is not rendered. Raghu Vira's correct reading *etasyai yataḥ* also occurs JB. 3, 377 *sa yad asmāl lokād evamvit praity eṣā* (referring to a *devatā* which is called *prāṇa*, but described as the sun) *haivainam devatāddāyotpatati. sainam tam lokam gamayati ya etasyai* (referring back to *devatā* as at JB. 1, 11) *yataḥ paraṃ nāsti*. Remarkably the last sentence is found without variations JB. 1, 11. Since at least in the context of JB. 1, 11 many worlds beyond the sun are mentioned, *yataḥ paraṃ nāsti* does not relate to distance, but to quality. Cf. ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 10 *etad agnihotram yājñavalkya nātaḥ param astīti hovāca*.

⁵ Cf. ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 7 (those who are on the other side of the sun, of death, are immortal, are gods); JB. 3, 359 *te ye 'rvāñco raśmaya ete hāvaśā mṛtyor annavantaḥ, aha ya ūrdhvās ta u hāmytalokāḥ*.

⁶ Night and day represent time in its destructive aspect and are the opposite of eternity and immortality. They destroy the good deeds in yonder world. See TB. 3, 10, 11, 2 and ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 11 (which expressly states that their scope is on this side of the sun, so that the good deeds of the deceased who has reached the sun cannot be destroyed).

⁷ On the difference between the roots *manth-* "to churn" and *math-* "to take away, to rob" see Johanna Narten, "Das Vedische Verbum *math*", *I.I.J.* 4, p. 121-135. With reference to the present passage she observes (o.c., p. 127): "JB. I 11 (Caland, *Auswahl*, § 4) wird als Gegensatz zu der Unsterblichkeit, die man jenseits der Sonne gewinnt, festgestellt: *atha yad arvācīnam ādityād, ahorātre tad upamathnīyātām ito yathā reṣmopamathnīyād evam* "was aber diesseits der Sonne ist, das dürften Tag und Nacht von hier rauben gerade so wie ein Sturmwind raubt" [with the following note on *upamathnīyātām*:] Wohl so zu lesen statt handschriftlichem *upamathnītām*, wofür Caland Part. *upamathatī* (das übrigens, sofern vom Präsensstamm, *upamathnatī* heissen müsste) konjiziert und mit *itaḥ* als 2. Du. von *i* "gehen" verbindet: "das wird beständig durch Tag und Nacht (d.h. durch die Zeit) zerstört". Bei einer solchen Auffassung von *itaḥ* wäre aber auch das zweite Verb in Part. + *i* aufzulösen, also (statt handschriftlichem *upamathnīyāt*) eine weitere Konjektur *upamathnan iyāt* zu machen. (Zu *upamathnītām*, wenn es nicht blosser Schreibfehler ist, vgl. Opt. *trāsīyāthām*, Oldenberg *ZDMG*, 63, p. 297)". The argument that Caland's conjecture would require a second one (*upamathnan iyāt*) is not convincing since the activity of the whirlwind is not continuous as in the case of night and day. The parallelism between *upameya* and *upamāna* is not complete here. The optative *upamathnīyāt* expresses "as it may happen that ..." or "as if a whirlwind would ...". This brings me to another criticism. Why should the parallelism between main and subordinate clause in this simile be such that *upamathnītām* should represent an optative (like *upamathnīyāt*)? The translation "das dürften Tag und Nacht von hier rauben" expresses a contingency which hardly was the brāhmaṇa-author's intention. An optative is not suitable here. On the other hand Caland's conjecture (emended to *upamathnatī*) seems to be too

radical. In the context *upamathnītām* would form an excellent injunctive ("erwähnende Beschreibung"; "zeitlos"; see Hoffmann, *Der Injunktiv im Veda*, Heidelberg 1967) but for its late occurrence in a Vedic prose text (according to Hoffmann, o.c., p. 110 the "nicht-prohibitive Injunktiv" is not found in Vedic prose). *Non liquet*.

* Cf. JUB. 3, 5, 9, 3 *te sarva āptā bhavanti te jītās teṣu asya sarveṣu kāmācāro bhavati ya evaṃ veda*.

12-14. *Agni (= Death) is conquered by means of liquid oblations such as milk and especially soma*

A remote parallel of this extinction of Agni-Mṛtyu is found VādhS. 3, 32 (A.O. 4, p. 30) in the agnihotra section: *tad u vā eṣa eva mṛtyur yad agniḥ; sa yaj jvalati juhuyān, mṛtyor mukhe pūrvām āhutim juhuyān mṛtyor mukha uttarām; sa yatraiva bahurūpā ivāṅgārāḥ syus, tat samidham ādhāya kanīyo hutvā bhūyo juhuyān; mṛtyum eva pūrvayāhutiyā śamayitvā suvargam lokam uttarayādhikrāmati*. One offers on the charcoals and not in the flames in order to subdue Agni (= Death) present in the coals.

The *somāhuti* which is described as a more efficacious extinguisher of Agni-Death than the milk-oblation may be an incidental agnihotra performed with *soma* instead of milk. JB. 1, 14 seems to give the special formulas for that soma-agnihotra.

For JB. 1, 12-13 see Caland, *Auswahl*, § 5.

12. The gods were fighting with Death. Death on that occasion was Agni.¹ They said: "Come, let us try to subdue² him³". They said: "Let us offer a butter-oblation and try to subdue him by that". "So be it". They offered a butter-oblation. This he made his food, towards this he blazed up. Therefore it (the sacrificial fire) blazes up towards it when they offer a butter-oblation.

They said: "Let us offer a victim as oblation and try to subdue him by that". "So be it". Having killed a victim and cut the fat into small pieces they offered a victim-oblation. This he made his food, towards this he blazed up. Therefore it (the sacrificial fire) blazes up towards it, when they offer a victim as oblation.

They said: "Let us offer a milk-oblation and try to subdue him by that". "So be it". They offered a milk-oblation. By that they subdued him. Therefore (extinguished) coals are the result, when they offer a milk-oblation. They said: "We have subdued⁴ him by means of food.⁵ Well, let us try to subdue him once and for all".

13. They said: "Let us offer a soma-oblation and try to subdue him by that". "So be it". They performed a soma-sacrifice. They offered a soma-oblation. By that they subdued him completely. Therefore coals are the result, when they offer a soma-oblation.

He who knowing thus offers a butter-oblation or a victim as oblation thereby hits upon his (Mṛtyu-Agni's) favourite speciality.⁶ But when he offers a milk-oblation, then he subdues him by that. And

when he offers a soma-oblation, it is as though after having subdued him once he would finally defeat him. He escapes from those two repeated dyings which are night and day.⁷

14. **somāhutighaṭṭah* (?).⁸ He lays on a firewood (reciting:) "For outbreathing thee".⁹ He offers the oblation (reciting:) "I have placed immortality in the inbreathing, *svāhā*".¹⁰ Then he touches the ladle¹¹ (reciting:)¹² "My heart¹³ is the setting out, my mind the continuous progress, my sight the turning towards, my hearing the drawing near,¹⁴ my speech the arrival. The oblation has fallen to the share¹⁵ of the gods and been enjoyed. It has placed me¹⁶ in immortality. Let my lifebreaths enter¹⁷ me (again) that I may do more good deeds". He does more good deeds. And in yonder world the evil re-putation of being a sinner¹⁸ does not reach him who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

NOTES

¹ For the identification of fire and death see besides the parallel from VādhS. quoted in the introduction ŚB. 2, 2, 4, 7; ŚāṅkhB. 13, 3, 4; JUB. 1, 8, 1, 8; 2, 5, 1, 2; VādhS. 3, 19 (A.O. 4, p. 19 f.).

² *jigīṣāma* is the subjunctive of a desiderative with conative force. Caland, *Auswahl*, p. 293, n. 1 needlessly doubts the correctness of this reading in JB. 3, 370.

³ Read with Caland (who gives no v. l.) *etemaṃ*. The crit. ed. has *ete 'mum*.

⁴ The corrupt *ajeṣu* should be emended to *ajeṣma* (instead of *ajaiṣma* proposed by Caland).

⁵ Caland reads *anena* instead of *annena*.

⁶ This does not imply that the offerer of a butter- or victim-oblation falls into the hands of Death. These oblations are only inferior since Death is not subdued, but temporarily appeased. Going to a god's *priyaṃ dhāma* means averting his anger if he is a terrifying deity as appears from ŚB. 9, 1, 1, 22 . . . *tasmād yatra itasmād devāc* (sc. Rudra) *chaṅketa tad etābhir vyāhrtibhir juhuyāt. upa haivaitasya devasya priyaṃ dhāma gacchati. tathā hainam eṣa devo na hinasti*. Going to Indra's *priyaṃ dhāma* (ŚāṅkhB. 22, 4) implies "that one comes into contact with Indra's divine sphere" (Gonda, *The Meaning of the Sanskrit Term dhāman-*, Amsterdam Acad. 1967, p. 62). This access to a god's favourite *dhāma* is mostly gained by offering oblations which are somehow especially connected with, sacred to or dear to that god. Now clarified butter is the *priyaṃ dhāma* of Agni (Gonda, o.c., p. 25) and of the gods in general (o.c., p. 26: "one supplies them with their *priyaṃ dhāman-* when one makes an offering with clarified butter"). In the present passage Agni's *priyaṃ dhāma* is reached by offering his *priyaṃ dhāma*, i.e. butter or a victim. What is that *dhāma* to which one comes? Sometimes *dhāman-* denotes something very concrete such as "abode" and coming to a god's beloved *dhāma* means "gaining access to the god's presence" (Gonda, p. 64). See also KauṣU. 3, 1, where Prātardana after reaching Indra's *priyaṃ dhāma* is addressed by that god. Now *dhāman-* does not simply mean "abode". It has as its original, central meaning "location, manifestation, projection etc. of a god's divine

power", as is demonstrated by Gonda, who refers (o.c., p. 62) to this general meaning in connection with JB. 1, 13. I am under the impression that *priyaṃ evāṣya tena dhāmopagacchati* here does not refer to actually reaching the god in one of his favourite abodes, but that it denotes something like "to hit upon the god's speciality, special sphere, special interest, special sphere of interest (by offering his favourite oblation); to catch his fancy; to come in his good books". Compare the passage from ŚB. 9, 1, 1, 22 quoted above.

⁷ The same sentence occurs at the end of 1, 6, where in the context of the discussion on the right time for the performance of the agnihotra night and day represent death rather than recurring death. On the other hand the statement that night and day are recurring death has no foundation in the direct context of 1, 13 (only 1, 11 mentions night and day). Is the end of 1, 13 (originally dealing with the deliverance from death or rather with its subjection) influenced by the end of 1, 6, where night and day indeed occur and *atimuc-* is more suitable in the context?

⁸ This word, which is probably corrupt, does not occur elsewhere. Perhaps an agnihotra with a soma-oblation is announced at the beginning of this chapter which contains formulas without parallels in the ordinary agnihotra ritual.

⁹ No sūtra prescribes this formula (which frequently is used in other contexts) for this action. On *prāṇa-* meaning "outbreathing" see Caland, *Z.D.M.G.* 55, p. 518 and P.-E. Dumont's defense of this interpretation *J.A.O.S.* 78, p. 51 ff. (against Edgerton).

¹⁰ No parallel. Does *amṛtam* refer to the soma which is offered instead of the usual milk-oblation? That the fire represents the sacrificer's *prāṇa* or *apāna* appears also from the formula recited when a piece of wood is put on the fire: . . . *iṣṭakām upadādhe 'mṛtam apāne* (evening agnihotra: *prāṇe*) *dadhāmi* (BSS. 3, 6: 74. 13-18; VādhS. has *prāṇe* for both agnihotras according to Caland's ms.-transcript, p. 12 f. in the University Library of Utrecht). See also *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. III.

¹¹ No sūtra states that the ladle should be touched after the *āhuti*. One touches the agnihotrahavanī after the milk has been ladled out and recites the *daśahoty*, a formula which only consists of equations between vital powers etc. and other entities and in this respect may be compared to *hṛdayaṃ pretir manas saṃtatiḥ* . . . in the present text.

¹² The following formulas do not occur elsewhere. For the first compare VS. 20, 13 *lomāni prayatir mama tvan ma ānatir āgatiḥ māmsaṃ ma upanatir vasu asthi majjā ma ānatir*. Eggeling translates this formula which is used at the *sautrāmaṇi*: "My hair is endeavour, my skin submission and approach, my flesh inclination, my bone wealth, and my marrow submission" (ŚB. 12, 8, 3, 31). He observes in a note that the repetition of *ānati-* is strange and that a strong alliterative cadence is noticeable. Even more noticeable, however, is the occurrence of four words ending in *-ti*, among which *vasu* seems to be out of place. Probably the formula is corrupt. The repeated *ānati-* should be replaced by another word in *-ti* and *vasu* be removed. Remarkably the identification *vasu asthi* reverses the order; in the other four homologies the parts of the body precede. VS. has *prayati-*, *ānati-*, (and *āgati-*, which should shift to the last position and replace the repeated *ānati-*), *upanati-*, [*vasu-*, *ānati-*] *āgati-* corresponding to the nomina actionis of the JB. formula (*preti-*, *saṃtati-*, *ānati-*, *upanati-*, *āgati-*). Obviously *saṃtati-* instead of *vasu-* belongs to this classification. JB. equates this fivefold series with the five vital powers, VS. with the five essential ingredients of the body. So apparently this identification is not based on one by one agreements of the

single elements of both series (i.e. *lomāni* and *prayati-* or *hṛdayam* and *preti-* or *lomāni* and *hṛdayam* do not obviously correspond as *prāṇa* and *vāyu* in micro-macrocosmic homologies), but consists of the equation of two series as a totality characterized by the same number. This implies that the nomina actionis *preti-* etc. must form an established unity of five items and that somehow a system more significant than "a strong alliterative cadence" should be discovered in them. In the version used in the *sautrāmaṇi* ritual *prayati-* ("endeavour" Eggeling; "Gabe" Caland's transl. of ĀpŚS. 19, 10, 2) occurs instead of *preti*; the other terms (i.e. deriving from *nam-*) seem to lie in the sphere of submission. According to Mahīdhara on ŚB. 12, 8, 3, 31 they show the state of feeling of beings towards the royal sacrificer in the *sautrāmaṇi*. See also Sāyaṇa on TB. 2, 6, 5, 8. This interpretation may be correct in the context of the *sautrāmaṇi*, in JB. it does not make sense. Here we seem to have a development from *preti-* "departure" (on JB. *preti-* for ŚB. *prayati-* compare JB. 1, 56, where *preta-* has *prayata-* in the ŚB. parallel) to *āgati-* "arrival". The five terms ending in *-ti* may represent the successive stages of the course to heaven of the oblation (which is identical with the sacrificer's vital powers). The next verse states that the oblation has reached the gods, that it has placed the sacrificer (or rather his *prāṇāḥ*) in immortality and that the *prāṇāḥ* must re-enter the body. The VS. verse may have expressed the same idea, but have been reinterpreted in the *sautrāmaṇi* context. One may, however, notice that ŚB. 12, 8, 3, 31 immediately after this formula refers to a "going to heaven". On the other hand the series from *lomāni* to *majjā* represents a succession from the most outward to the most inward element. On the terms *ānati* and *upanati* denoting a movement see n. 14. Now one may ask why a journey is described with five terms and why these very terms *saṃtati*, *ānati* and *upanati* are used. The explanation at least in the context of JB. is rather simple. One touches the ladle and starts with the top of the handle (*preti*). Then one continues (*saṃtati*) in one straight line along the handle which connects the two extremities of the ladle. Towards the end of the journey one reaches the beak of the ladle and consequently has to deviate from the straight course. While "rounding" the beak one makes two curves (*natis*): downwards and upwards or towards oneself and from oneself (*ā-* and *upa-*). Ultimately one reaches the extremity of the ladle (*āgati*).

¹³ Remarkably *hṛdayam* takes the place of *prāṇa* in this formula, whereas the next verse speaks of *prāṇāḥ* (*ā māṃ prāṇā viśantu*), probably the vital powers *manas*, *caḥṣus* etc.

¹⁴ The compounds of *nam-* do not always mean "to bend, bow". Often they denote a turning towards, a directing oneself to, an aiming at, a drawing near. So here *ānati-* and *upanati-* may refer to the turning towards a goal (cf. in English: to bend one's steps towards) and the drawing near, if they do not simply express the curving movement of the finger striking along the beak of the ladle (see n. 12).

¹⁵ I take *pratīṭam* as well as *juṣṭam* together with *asthāt* in a periphrastic construction which expresses the perfective aspect of the arrival of the oblation.

¹⁶ I.e. the vital powers.

¹⁷ The *prāṇāḥ* (in this case perhaps the vital powers and not the breaths) have to return to the body of the sacrificer. As often the sacrifice produces a temporary reaching of immortality in heaven, after which one has to return in order to live on. According to ŚSS. 2, 9, 7 the sacrificer exhales after the first oblation with the formula *agan prāṇaḥ svargaṃ lokam* .. and inhales

after the second with *āgann apāna ātmānam* .. The only parallel for this action in the sūtras is found in VādhS. (Caland's ms.-transcript, p. 12): .. *huvānuṣṭrāṇity amṛtam prāṇam mayi dadhāmy ā mā prāno viśatu sahāmy-tena śāntiā apradāhāyati*; .. *anvāpānity amṛtam apānam* .. etc. Here the exhalation as well as inhalation (again) place a breath in the sacrificer. Compare the *prāṇāgnihotra* formula (BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 3) *prāṇe nivīṣṭo 'mṛtam juhomī śivo māviśāpradāhāya prāṇāya svāhā*, in which *śivo* cannot refer to the food offered and the *prāṇāḥ* seem to be described as entering the performer.

¹⁸ The word *pāpivāc-* does not occur elsewhere. Here *vāc* means "talk, rumour, report". Compare TS. 2, 1, 10, 2 *apūtā vā etam vāg ṛcchati yam ajaghnivāṃsam abhiśaṃsanti* and PB. 2, 17, 4 *śamalam vā etam ṛcchati yam aślīlā vāg* ("ugly report" tr. Caland) *ṛcchati*. A bad reputation on earth, even if it is only based on slander, reaches the gods who are influenced by it in their judgments. See E. W. Hopkins, *Trans. Conn. Ac. A. Sc.* 15 (1909), p. 34.

15-16. *The discrimination of the good and bad deeds and the deliverance from the results of the bad deeds by means of the two agnihotra oblations*

This section seems to link up with the preceding, in which *sukṛtaṃ karoti* and *amuṣmin loke na pāpivāg āgacchati* may form the starting-point for the following discussion on the deliverance from sin at or before death. For a different treatment of this subject see JB. I, 9-10.

15. As to this they say: "The good and the evil which a man does during his life, what is the discrimination¹ of these evil and good deeds?" The good which a man does during his life passes into his breaths, the wrong into his body. When the one who knows thus departs from this world, his good deeds rise up together with his breath and his wrong deeds are left with his body. As to this they say: "It is difficult to be sure² (that this will happen), when being about to die (?)³ he will still have remained⁴ with his wrong deeds. If (however) he gets rid of them already during his lifetime, it is perfectly known". Then indeed it (sc. the effect of his evil deeds) passes into the agnihotra.

16. The breaths correspond to mind; the body⁵ to speech. When he offers the first oblation with speech (i.e. reciting the formula) and the second (reciting the formula) in thought (*manasā*), then he separates⁶ the evil and the good deeds. Therefore they say: "These two oblations must not be confused. For he separates the evil and the good deeds by means of them".

When he offers the first of the two evening-oblations with speech, by this (oblation) he rids himself of that evil which he commits by day. And when he offers the second (reciting the formula) in thought, by this (oblation) he rids himself of that evil which he commits overnight. And when he offers the first of the two morning-oblations with speech, by this (oblation) he rids himself of that evil which he commits overnight. When he offers the second (reciting the formula) in thought, by this (oblation) he rids himself of that evil which he commits by day. He keeps ridding himself of (the effects of) his evil deeds day by day who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

NOTES

¹ Although the verb *vyāvartate* means "to be rid of" in this section, *vyāvṛtti-* here is not "deliverance" or "liberation" but "discrimination". All good and evil has to be separated. Cf. JB. 2, 35; 183; 188; 3, 306; ŚB. 12, 7, 3, 15; TB. 1, 8, 6, 5; 2, 1, 8, 2 (*pāpavasyasya vyāvṛtīyai*); TB. 1, 3, 3, 5 (*pāpavasyasya vidhṛtyai*); PB. 6, 1, 12; 8, 9, 7; 13, 4, 8 (*pāpavasiyaso vidhṛtyai*); ŚaṅvB. 1, 4, 6 (*pāpavasiyasaṃ vyākariṣyāmi*). Perhaps a socio-religious discrimination underlies this view that good and evil should not be mixed. ŚB. 4, 1, 4, 5 states that, if a brahmin becomes the purohita of any one kṣatriya he may meet with or if a kṣatriya takes any brahmin as his purohita, good and wrong deeds would be mixed (*saṃ hy etaṃ sṛjete sukṛtaṃ ca duṣkṛtaṃ ca*). For the same combination of discrimination between good and evil with liberation from evil as is found in this section see PB. 2, 1, 4 *pāpavasiyaso vidhṛtir. vi pāpmanā vartate ya etayā stute*. Cf. JB. I, 133 (*Auswahl*, § 29) *bṛhadhrathantare vyavartayet . . vi pāpmanā vartate*.

² No moral objections are put forward against the theory that sin is left on earth with the body, but the uncertainty inherent in this theory (*durviditā vai tad*) induces the author to prefer the safer separation of good and wrong deeds before death by means of the agnihotra.

³ *martyavān*. There are no parallels and the text may be corrupt. It is the opposite of *jīvaṃ eva* in the next sentence.

⁴ The subjunctive after *yadā* has the value of a fut. perf. according to Delbrück, *Altindische Syntax*, p. 325.

⁵ Here *ātman-* means "body". It is identical with *śarīram* in the preceding chapter.

⁶ For a different separation brought about by the two oblations see ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 17 *manaś ca ha vai vāk caite āhūtī. tan manaś caivaitā vācam ca vyāvartayati. tasmād idam manaś ca vāk ca samānam eva san nāneva*.

17-18. Man has a human and a divine yoni and ātman. By sacrificing in the āhavanīya one produces a second ātman in heaven, in the sun, with which one is united after death, if one has the required knowledge of the self

This section, which in the present form represents a unity, was edited and translated by Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 19, p. 115 ff. and E. Windisch, *Berichte K.S.G.d.W.* 59 (1907), p. 111 ff. For a translation see also J. Hertel, *Die Weisheit der Upanishaden* (München 1922²), p. 150 ff. and A. Frenz, *I.I.J.* 11 (1969), p. 125 ff. Two different passages seem to have been combined here. The first deals with man's two yonis. The father is reborn in his son, but he also produces a second self in heaven by offering the agnihotra in the āhavanīya (here we touch the central theme of JB. 1, 1-65 in this section which for the rest hardly refers to the agnihotra). After death one rises to heaven in order to be united with this second self. Here the text inserts a description of the path to the sun (with a conversation between the deceased and the doorkeepers of the sun) which also occurs (in a different form) in 1, 46 and 1, 49-50. The first and original passage continues with the arrival in heaven. Remarkably the conversation between the deceased and the sun, in which the sun gives back the ātman produced by the agnihotrin if the wrong answer is given to the question "Who art thou?", is also found at JUB. 3, 3, 4, 1 ff. The original passage seems to be continued at the very point where the JUB. parallel starts. It remains doubtful whether this continuation forms an original, complete unity with 1, 17. The effect of producing a self in heaven by performing the agnihotra seems to be overshadowed by the requirement that one correctly answers the question "Who art thou?". The connection with 1, 17 is, however, not excluded, whereas the passage with the verse *vicakṣaṇād* obviously forms an insertion. JB. 1, 18 seems to contain a double test of the deceased. Twice he has to show that he knows that he is not an individual, but identical with the highest god. In the conversation with the doorkeepers there is no connection at all with the preceding agnihotra passage of 1, 17. The insertion rather abruptly starts with *tasya haitasya rtavo dvārapāḥ*, in which the genitive hardly refers back to the deceased, but presumably denotes the sun. See n. 15.

Since the passage in which the deceased answers the question "Who art thou?" or announces himself with the verse *vicakṣaṇād rtavo* . . . occurs also KauṣU. 1, 2 there exist many interpretations. Besides the above mentioned literature (which deals with the JB. versions) one may also consult Böhtlingk, *Berichte K.S.G.d.W.* 42 (1890), p. 198 ff. [the first critical treatment of this passage]; Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's* (Leipzig 1897), p. 25 ff. [who rightly did not assume imperatives in the verse]; Windisch, "Buddha's Geburt", *Abh. K.S.G.d.W.* 26, 2 (Leipzig 1908), p. 68 ff. [see his other publication mentioned above]; Keith, *The Śāṅkhāyana Āraṇyaka* (London 1908), p. 17 ff. [like Deussen not assuming imperatives]; S. K. Belvalkar, *Third Oriental Conference* (Madras 1925),

p. 41 ff. [following Windisch and Hertel]; Geldner, *Vedismus und Brahmanismus* (Tübingen 1928³), p. 142 [following Deussen and Keith]; Renou, *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad* (Paris 1948), p. 16 ff. [following Windisch] and S. Bhattacharya, *A.I.O.C.* 16 (Lucknow 1955), p. 1 ff. [taking *mā* as the prohibitive particle with the injunctive]. In my paper "Der Vers *vicakṣaṇād rtavo* . . .", *Z.D.M.G. Supplementa I* (1969), p. 843 ff. I have tried to show that those who follow Böhtlingk in taking *erayadhvam* and *āsiṣikta* (or its v.l.) as imperatives are wrong and that Windisch' solution of the problem that the imperatives *erayadhvam* (send me in a man) and *ānayadhvam* (take me to immortality) are contradictory, is untenable. The verse does not consist of two alternative answers or announcements. By reciting the whole verse the deceased demonstrates his knowledge of his heavenly origin and gives the password. The form *erayadhvam* is not a simple imperfect with omitted augment as Deussen, Geldner, Keith and Frenz seem to take it, but an injunctive. The deceased does not tell the doorkeepers something new. He just states an eternal, "zeitlos" truth. Here the function of the injunctive as an "erwähnende Beschreibung" (Hoffmann, *Der Injunktiv im Veda*, Heidelberg 1967, p. 163) is very suitable in the context.

The continuation of the original passage (after the insertion from *tasya haitasya rtavo dvārapāḥ to tam hātyarjayante*) with the discussion between the sun and the deceased apparently was misunderstood by Windisch and Hertel. First the wrong answer (the mentioning of one's name) to the question "Who art thou?" is described; then the correct answer follows. In view of the fact that the two scholars mentioned are wrong in their interpretation of the verse as well as of the rest of the passage, their remarks on the original stage of the three versions (Windisch, o.c., p. 120; *Buddha's Geburt*, p. 72; Hertel, o.c., p. 149 ff.) are not relevant. On the other versions see JB. 1, 46 and 1, 49 f. The passage with the verse *vicakṣaṇād* has a more original form in this section in that the vocative *rtavaḥ* agrees with the *rtus* which are addressed with the verse. Moreover the end of the verse at JB. 1, 50 looks less original and more resembles the late version of KauṣU.

17. Two wombs, indeed, there are. The divine womb is the one, the human womb the other.¹ There are, indeed, also two worlds. The divine world is the one, the human world the other.

The human womb is (related to) the human world.² It is the generative organ of the woman. Out of that progeny is born. Therefore also one should desire a good wife (thinking:) "Let my Self come into existence in something good."³ Therefore also one should seek to watch over⁴ one's wife (thinking:) "Lest in my womb, in my world somebody else come into existence". When he is about to come into existence (during the coitus) the lifebreaths enter first, then the seed is emitted. He (sc. the prāṇa) turns the lifebreaths to

the (corresponding) orifices.⁵ Therefore also one is born with those very characteristics which he (the father) possesses, although in semen (itself) there is no differentiation.⁶

And the āhavanīya is the divine womb, (which means) the divine world.⁷ That one, forsooth, is the divine womb, the divine world. Therefore if anyone would offer in the gārhapatya, one might think of him: "He does what should not be done".⁸ If he who correctly acts⁹ (by offering in the āhavanīya) offers, then he thereby emits his Self in this divine womb. That Self of his comes into existence in yonder sun. He who knows thus has two Selves and two wombs. One Self and one womb has he who does not know this. When knowing thus one departs from this¹⁰ world —

18. ¹¹ — the lifebreath ascends first. It announces to the gods the quantity:¹² "So much good, so much evil has been done by him".¹³ Thereupon he (i.e. the body)¹⁴ rises up along with the smoke (of the funeral pyre).

Of that one (who gives out heat)¹⁵ the seasons¹⁶ are doorkeepers. To them he should announce himself¹⁷ with this (verse).¹⁸

"O, Seasons, from the radiant¹⁹ one, which is pressed out²⁰ every half month,²¹ from the one who is connected with the pitṛs²² the seed is produced. As such you sent²³ me in a man as your agent. From that man, your agent, you emitted²³ me in a mother. Thus I am produced,²⁴ being added²⁴ to itself by the twelvefold²⁵ (year) as the additional, thirteenth month. This I know, of this I am sure.²⁶ So lead me, O Seasons, to immortality".²⁷

Him the seasons lead. As one who knows (leads) one who also knows,²⁸ as one who understands one who understands also,²⁸ so the seasons lead him. They convey him across. He comes to the one who gives out heat.

²⁹At his arrival he (the sun) asks him: "Who art thou?" To him who announces himself by his (personal) name or by his family (name), he says: "That Self of yours that has been in me, that is yours (again)".³⁰ After that Self has been received back the seasons from all sides run towards him, grasp him by his feet and drag him away.³¹ Night and day take possession of his world.

He should announce himself to him (the sun) with these words: "Ka (who) am I, thou art heaven.³² As such I have gone to thee, the heavenly heaven".³³ Prajāpati indeed is Ka and he who knows thus is *suvargas* (heaven; sun). For he goes to heaven (*suvar gacchati*). To him he (the sun) says: "Who thou art, that one am I. Who I am,

that one thou art. Come."³⁴ He approaches that essence of good deeds.³⁵

His sons enter upon his inheritance, the Fathers upon (the effects of) his good conduct.³⁶ He who knows thus has two selves and two inheritances. If without knowing this one offers the agnihotra one has only one self and one inheritance.

NOTES

¹ Cf. ŚB. 7, 4, 2, 40 *dve vai yonī iti brūyād devayonir anyo manuṣyayonir anyah. prācinaprajananā vai devāḥ prācinaprajananā manuṣyās. tad yad etāḥ prācīr upadadhāti devayoner evaitad yajamānam prajanayati*. See also JB. 1, 259 *dvir ha vai yajamāno jāyate. mithunād anyaj jāyate yajñād anyat. tad yan mithunāj jāyate tad asmai lokāya jāyate, atha yad yajñāj jāyate tad amuṣmai lokāya jāyate*.

² Oertel, o.c., p. 116 translates "What this human womb is, that is the human world", and *Syntax of Cases*, p. 132 "The human world is (identical with) the human womb". The first translation is correct in taking *sā yā manuṣyayonir* as the subject, the second in avoiding the assumption of an elliptic relative clause. On the latter point (the interpretation of the pronoun *ya-*) see Gonda, *Lingua* 4 (1954), p. 1 ff.

³ The reading *kalyāṇe* should with Hertel, o.c., p. 150 and Veda Vyasa be retained (see also Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 132), because *kalyāṇo* (Oertel's emendation) would imply that the quality of the future self should depend on the mother, a non-Vedic idea. The self of the father is continued in the son. Cf. AB. 7, 13; AU. 2; Manu 9, 8 and Windisch, *Buddha's Geburt*, p. 62.

⁴ *jugupset*. The active of this desiderative (in the middle voice meaning "to avoid") is exceptional (Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 132). See, however, also TĀ. 10, 9, 1 and VādhS. 3, 101 (*A.O.* 4, p. 204). On guarding one's wife see BDhS. 2, 2, 3, 34 (... *tasmāt svabhāryām rakṣantu bibhyataḥ paravetasah* ... *mā vah kṣetre parabijāni vāpsuh*). See also Manu 9, 7-9.

⁵ *sa imān prāṇān ākāśān abhi ni(r)vartate*. Oertel, o.c., p. 116 translates: "He returns these breaths (to the?) spaces", whereas Windisch, o.c., p. 115 f. conjectures *prākāśayann* and renders: "Er kehrt wieder, (indem er) diese Hauche (zum Vorschein bringt)". Hertel, o.c., p. 151 follows Windisch, but Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 133 rightly condemning this emendation developed a new interpretation: "He (viz. he who is about to come into existence) turns toward these breaths (which, in the macrocosm, are identical with) the ethereal spaces". His argument that the identification of the microcosmic *prāṇāḥ* with the macrocosmic *ākāśāḥ* corresponds to the identification of the microcosmic *manuṣyayoni-* with the macrocosmic *manuṣyaloka-* does not convince, since *manuṣyaloka-* hardly refers to a macrocosm in which ethereal spaces are found. The parallels adduced to show the connection of the *prāṇāḥ* with the *ākāśāḥ* are not conclusive. At ChU. 4, 10, 5; ŚB. 10, 6, 3, 2; 14, 7, 2, 6 (= BĀU. 4, 4, 6 Mādhy. = 5 K.) and KauṣU. 2, 14 one misses a plural *ākāśāḥ*. The only correct parallel is JB. 2, 18 *reto vā etad agre praviśati yad gāyatrām. tato 'nyāny āṅgāni vikriyante. prāṇo vā eṣa praviśati yad gāyatrām tam anyāny āṅgāny upasidanti. sa imān prāṇān ākāśān abhi nirmanthati* "The seed, viz. the Gāyatrī metre, enters first, from it the other members (of the body) are respectively fashioned; this breath indeed, viz. the Gāyatrī

metre, enters, the other members (of the body) cluster round it; this (primary) breath churns out (= generates) these (other) breaths (= sense organs) with reference to (?) the ethereal spaces" (tr. Oertel). A. Frenz, *Über die Verben im Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* (thesis Marburg 1966), p. 61, n. 3 rightly interprets *ākāśāḥ* as the openings which are the seats of the senses: "Er quirlt diese prāṇas [d.h. die Sinne] zu den Öffnungen hinaus". He proposes to read *abhinirvartate* in JB. 1, 17 and translates: "Er kommt heraus zu diesen prāṇas nach den Öffnungen hin". See also his rendering *I.I.J.* 11, p. 126: "Der [nicht-irdische Ātman] kommt heraus zu diesen Prāṇas nach den Öffnungen hin". On *ākāśāḥ* meaning "openings" see JUB. 2, 4, 2, 10. . . *taṃ vai praviśateti. sa vā ākāśān kuruṣveti. sa imān prāṇān ākāśān akuruta. taṃ vāg eva bhūtvā "gniḥ praviśan mano bhūtvā candramāḥ . . ."* "Verily enter that". "Then make spaces". He made these breaths spaces (for them). Fire, having become speech, entered that; (so did) the moon, having become mind . . ." (tr. Oertel). Here the *prāṇāḥ* are not lifebreaths or vital powers, but the organs of sense, or rather the orifices through which the gods (= vital powers, sense-functions) enter. See also A. K. Coomaraswamy, *J.A.O.S.* 66, p. 149, n. 13. The *ākāśāḥ* are in fact every kind of opening, e.g. the holes in a *viṇā* (JB. 2, 70; *Auswahl*, 128) or the vulva (JB. 3, 360: *tad adhaṣtāt prāṇam akuruta yathaiṣa śrīyā adhaṣtād ākāśa evam*; see Hoffmann, *M.S.S.* 27, p. 65: "Es tat den Atem [= Luft] nach unten. Wie das Weib unten eine Öffnung hat, so (war das)"; one may perhaps also compare ChU. 7, 12, 1 . . . *ākāśe ramate, ākāśena* (thus should be read instead of *ākāśe na ramate*). So evidently *ākāśān* at JB. 1, 17 and 2, 18 refers to the orifices.

Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 133 takes *imān* in *imān prāṇān* (JB. 1, 17) anaphoric. This anaphoric use, if ever occurring (see Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 209 and Speyer, *Ved. u. Sanskrit-Synt.*, p. 40, 133) is excluded at JB. 2, 18, where no *prāṇāḥ* are mentioned before and *imān prāṇān* means "these *prāṇāḥ* as they are known". Now it is perfectly clear that JB. 1, 17 and 2, 18, as far as the sentence *sa imān prāṇān ākāśān abhi nirvartate/nirmanthati* is concerned, belong together. So at JB. 1, 17 *imān prāṇān* neither refers back to *prāṇāḥ* in the preceding sentence, nor should be taken as the goal of the motion (Frenz: "zu diesen Prāṇas"), if at least any agreement with JB. 2, 18 is assumed. Most likely 2, 18 represents the original passage — it contains no problems at all — and 1, 17 is a careless borrowing from 2, 18. The subject *sa* originally was the *prāṇa* which together with the seed enters the *yonī*; the plural *prāṇāḥ* . . . *praviśanti* is not original. Cf. JUB. 3, 2, 5, 5 *yadā hy eva retāḥ siktam prāṇa āviśaty atha tat sambhavati*; ŚB. 7, 3, 1, 45 *prāṇam tad retasi dadhāti tasmād retāḥ siktam prāṇam abhisambhavati*. Together with *prāṇa* the *retas* develops into an embryo. The *prāṇa* (which represents the father and is indeed identical with the father's self now to be reborn in the son) forms the center around which the seed gradually produces the corporeal constituents. By a rotating motion (*manth-*; *vrt-*, here apparently transitive?) it drives the *prāṇāḥ* (which are developed by the *prāṇa* and not by *retas*) out (*niḥ*) towards (*abhi*) their positions in the orifices. Therefore the son looks like the father, since his *prāṇa* after being enveloped by the seed and later by the corporeal cover succeeds in manifesting itself (in the form of the *prāṇāḥ*) through the orifices (*ākāśāḥ*).

* See Windisch, o.c., p. 116 and Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 133 f. The participle *sataḥ* seems to favour Windisch' view that we have here a "Gen. absol. in der bekannten Bedeutung", as in a conjunct construction ("Therefore of the seed which is (always) the same", tr. Oertel) it would be quite superfluous.

⁷ Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 19, p. 115 wrongly places a stop after *deva-lokaḥ* and construes *yad āhavanīya eṣā ha vai devayonir deva-lokaḥ*. In equations with *yad* and *eṣa-*, however, *yad* never precedes *eṣa-* as Veda Vyasa observes. So the *daṇḍa* should be placed (as is done in the crit. ed.) after *āhavanīyaḥ*. Cf. ŚB. 12, 9, 3, 10 *devayonir vā eṣa yad āhavanīyaḥ*.

⁸ Oertel's reading *atra taṃ karoti* (accepted by Windisch, o.c., p. 116, who regarded *atra* as referring to "die Welt, die dem Gārhapatya entspricht, die irdische Welt", and by Hertel, o.c., p. 151, who assumed that rebirth in this world was mentioned here) was rightly emended to *akṛtam karoti* by Caland, "Emendationen zum Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa", *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 62. Veda Vyasa refers to AB. 2, 38, 11 *akṛtam akar iti vai nindanti* and 3, 33, 1 *akṛtam vai prajāpatiḥ karoti*. See also PB. 21, 15, 4.

⁹ *sa yaj juhōti yas sādhu karoti*. Oertel (o.c., p. 116) translates the second clause by "in that he does good" and Windisch (o.c., p. 111 reading *yaj* for *yas* and referring to JUB. 3, 3, 5, 6 *yad . . . yajante yat sādhu kurvanti tad eṣām ūrdhvam annādyam utsidati*) renders: "Was er opfert, was er gut handelt . . ." (o.c., p. 116). Cf. Frenz, o.c., p. 126: "Wenn man giesst, wenn man etwas Gutes tut . . .". Is there any parallel for good deeds being placed in the āhavanīya? More convincing is Hertel, o.c., p. 151 who translates: "Wenn er die Opferspende darbringt, wenn er sie gut ausführt . . .", and observes in a note: "d.h. wenn er beim Opfer keinen Fehler begeht". Here *sādhu kṛ-*, however, does not refer to a correct performance in general, but to pouring the oblation in the āhavanīya instead of the gārhapatya (which would be *akṛtam* instead of *sādhu*). For *sādhu karoti* meaning "to do it in the proper way; to undertake the right action (in the ritual)" cf. JB. 2, 387 *sādhu haivākṛta yad astoḍhvam*.

¹⁰ Read perhaps *sa yad asmāl lokād* (as at JB. 1, 15) or *sa yo 'smāl lokād* instead of *sa yasmāl lokād* (Windisch' rendering o.c., p. 110 "Aus welcher Welt der so wissende scheidet" does not make sense).

¹¹ The reference to PB. 8, 1, 4 and 13, 4, 17 which the editors make in their *Studies in the JB.* in connection with this chapter is based on Caland's translation of PB., which in a note on 8, 1, 4 refers to JB. 1, 18, 5 (read 1, 1851!).

¹² All the mss. except one read *sa he ya tū devebhya*. Oertel conjectures *haiva*, Frenz, o.c., p. 126, n. 33 *sa hetvā devebhya* ("Sobald dieser hingegangen ist, meldet er den Göttern . . ."). They base themselves on the reading *haivā* (or *haidvā*; see Oertel). Retaining the reading of the majority of the mss. and only adding an anusvāra I read *sa heyattām* (= *ha + iyattām*) *devebhya*, which fits the context excellently (*iyat . . . iyat . . .*).

¹³ This may relate to the weighing of the good and wrong deeds. See ŚB. 11, 2, 7, 33 and A. V. Williams Jackson, *Actes 10^{me} Congres Intern. des Orientalistes* (1894), II (Leyden 1895), p. 64-74. No punishment or reward for these wrong or good deeds, is, however, mentioned in this upaniṣad-like passage, which has knowledge of the self as criterion and does not elaborate the archaic motif of *prāṇa* announcing the amount of good or bad deeds. This motif may have been included in the text in order to connect this passage with JB. 1, 16 (*prāṇa* connected with good deeds), whose doctrine that all evil deeds are left with the body or removed by means of the agnihotra it contradicts for that matter.

¹⁴ Compare JB. 1, 49 *te atra māse śarīram cāsuś ca saṃgacchāte*, where body and "spirit" are likewise separated. Since *prāṇa* and *asu* are identical (cf. ŚB. 6, 6, 2, 6) *ayam* stands for *śarīram*. According to Thieme, "Der Weg durch den Himmel nach der Kaushitaki-Upanishad", *Wiss. Zs. Univ. Halle-Wittenberg* I, 3 (1951/52), p. 26 this means a fusion of old and new

conceptions. The one who rises up in the upaniṣadic parallels of this passage would be "der vom Feuer aufgelöste, von Rauch in die Höhe getragene, in verklärter Gestalt weiterlebende Leib". In a note he observes: "Auch das ältere JB. geht zunächst davon aus, dass es der Leib des Toten ist, den der Rauch des Leichenfeuers zum Mond bringt: 1, 49, 7 ff. Im Unterschied zu den Upanishaden versucht es aber diese Auffassung mit der Seelenvorstellung zu versöhnen". The concept, however, that the *asu* precedes the body is a very old one, as appears from RV. 10, 12, 1 (*asum ya iṣyur*). See Oldenberg, *Die Religion des Veda*, Stuttgart 1917³, p. 529. At RV. 10, 14, 8 and 10, 16, 5 the deceased (i.e. his soul?) must unite himself with his body (*saṃgacchasva tanvā; saṃgacchatām tanvā*). I cannot accept Thieme's view, o.c., p. 26: "Hier (i.e. in the upaniṣads) ist der alte Leib-Seele-Dualismus durchaus aufgegeben". Some passages dealing with the doctrine of the two paths had to refer to the body and its rise to heaven. It should not be inferred that this was the uniform concept in the upaniṣads. The upaniṣadic devayāna-theory has its origin in the speculations on the cremation, in which the body naturally plays an important part. When, however, the process of dying is the subject of speculation, quite different theories are developed in which some kind of soul or spirit leaves the body. See e.g. ChU. 8, 6, 5. It is true that JB. 1, 49 and probably also 1, 18 represent a fusion of two views, but not, as Thieme holds, of an old (soul rises up) and a new (refined body rises up) theory. It is a fusion of two different starting-points, a fusion which might take place at any moment in the Vedic period.

¹⁵ According to Windisch, o.c., p. 117 "unter *tasyaitasya* kann nur der *svargaloka* gemeint sein". Indeed this genitive cannot but refer to a palace or king to be guarded by those doorkeepers. Probably the insertion of this passage (see the introduction to this section) was rather carelessly made. The genitive refers to the sun. Cf. JB. 1, 46 *tasya haitasya devasyāhorātre ardhāmāsā māsā rīvasaṃvatsaro goptā ya eṣa tapati*.

¹⁶ The elements of time such as the seasons are doorkeepers of the sun because becoming immortal means getting out of phenomenal time. Sometimes immortality is regarded as lying beyond the year (see JB. 1, 46 quoted in note 15), sometimes the year (= the sun, Prajāpati) itself means immortality (e.g. in the verse *vicakṣaṇād* occurring in this section). "Das Jahr galt ... durch seinen mit dem Sonnenlauf identischen Kreisgang als Urbild des Unvergänglichen (vgl. auch ŚB. 11, 1, 2, 12)" (Gonda, *Die Religionen Indiens I*, Stuttgart 1960, p. 190). See also Heesterman, *The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration* (thesis Utrecht 1957), p. 186. While night and day are the symbols of destructive time and *punararmtyu* (see JB. 1, 6; 1, 11), the seasons are more related with immortality. See ŚB. 1, 6, 1, 9, where spring and winter are the doors of the year (= immortality).

¹⁷ For *prabrū-* meaning "to announce (oneself)" (not "to answer" as Oertel, o.c., p. 117 takes it) compare JB. 1, 22.

¹⁸ On the general interpretation of this verse see my paper "Der Vers *vicakṣaṇād rīavo ...*", *Z.D.M.G. Supplementa I* (1969), p. 843-848. See also the introduction of this section. The interpretation of the verse by Frenz, *I.I.J.* 11, p. 126 could not be taken into account in that paper. On the whole it is acceptable, but it does not account for the use of the injunctives *erayadhvam* and *āsiṣikta*.

¹⁹ As an epithet of Soma *vicakṣaṇa-* occurs in the RV. See also ŚāṅkhB. 4, 4; 7, 10; 12, 5, where Soma is identical with the moon and called *vicakṣaṇa-*. See also Gonda, *The Vision of the Vedic Poets* (The Hague 1963), p. 193 f. on this term.

²⁰ JB. reads *prasūtāt*, KauṣU. 1, 2 *prasūtāt*. Oertel, o.c., p. 117 does not seem to make any distinction between these forms. Translating "from the begotten one" he concludes that "there may be a pun between *su-* 'press' and *su-* 'beget'". Windisch, o.c., p. 118 considering *prasūtāt* to be the correct reading makes it refer to "den zunehmenden, durch das Zunehmen neu gezeugten Mond". AB. 4, 24, 14 f. (*dvādaśāham prasuto bhūtvā*) is, however, not a good parallel and his translation "Nachdem er zwölf Tage ein Neugeborener geworden ist" is hardly defensible. Keith' interpretation "Having pressed for twelve days continuously, having become born anew" is also not convincing. One should take *bhūtvā* with *prasuto* as at PB. 25, 5, 1 f. and probably assume an anacolouthic construction, in which *prasuta-* means "pressing", "pression" (see Renou, "Index védique", *J.V.S.* 2, p. 107). Geldner, *Vedismus und Brahmanismus* (Tübingen 1928²), p. 142 was the first to distinguish *prasūtāt* ("der geboren hat") from *prasutāt* ("von dem einen halben Monat (den abnehmenden Mond) lang ausgepressten"). This undoubtedly correct interpretation was also adopted by Renou, *Kauṣitaki Upaniṣad* (Paris 1948), p. 18, n. 19. Frenz, *I.I.J.* 11, p. 106 translates *prasūtāt* (KauṣU. 1, 2) by "[zum Gebären] Angetriebenen". The three roots *su-* "to press", *sū-* "to impel" and *sū-* "to procreate" often coincide in the mind of the Vedic thinkers. See Heesterman *Royal Consecration*, p. 72 f.; 136. For the halfmonthly pressing out of the moon by the gods see also ŚāṅkhB. 4, 4 and 7, 10.

²¹ Oertel, o.c., p. 117 takes *ardhamāsyam* with *retas* (cf. Frenz, o.c., p. 126: "halbmonatsalt"), but supposes that *ardhamāsam* may have been the original reading. Presumably it should be taken as an adverb with *prasūtāt*.

²² Hertel, o.c., p. 152 observes: "Der 'Herr der Väterwelt', d.h. der abgeschiedenen Vorfahren, ist der Mond, eben weil er die abgeschiedenen Seelen zunächst in sich aufnimmt". In the version of JB., however, the moon does not receive the deceased. Probably *pitryāvat* just as *vicakṣaṇa* is an old epithet of Soma. In the *samhitās* and *brāhmaṇas* this god is frequently called *pitṛmat-* and *pitṛdevatya-*, e.g. KS. 36, 13: 79. 10 f. *somam agre yajati somo vai pitṛnām devatā pitṛdevatyō hi somo. yat somam pitṛmantam yajati somapāṃs tat pitṛn yajati*. Probably *pitryāvat-* literally meaning "who has relationship with the pitṛs" does not refer to a specific function in this context; it is an epithet of Soma, here identified with the moon which is pressed out.

²³ On the injunctives *erayadhvam* and *āsiṣikta* see "Der Vers *vicakṣaṇād*", o.c., p. 846 ff.

²⁴ In *sa upajāyopajāyamāno* the double sandhi is strange, as the metre requires *upajāya upajāyamāno*. Oertel, o.c., p. 117 translates "As such am I reborn, being born anew". Not rebirth, however, is referred to, but additional birth as at RV. 1, 25, 8 *veda māso dhṛtāvratō dvādaśa prajāvataḥ veda ya upajāyate*. Man is produced by the year as something additional to itself, as the thirteenth additional month. On the thirteenth month as an addition see ŚB. 6, 2, 2, 29 *upa ca trayodaśo māsaḥ*. PB. 19, 3, 3 *upajan-* also means "to add": *ekaikā stotriyopajāyate prajāṃ evāsmāi upajanayati*. It would be useless here to discuss the interpretation of those scholars who follow Windisch in regarding *sa upajāyopajāyamāno ...* etc. as the alternative speech of those deceased who are liberated and now reborn in a supernatural way in heaven. See my paper "Der Vers *vicakṣaṇād ...*". The predicate *upajāye* refers to man's birth on earth. By reciting the whole verse the deceased shows that he knows his divine origin and identity with the year. He is produced (*upajan-*) by the year (the totality of the *ṛtus*) and added (*upajan-*) as the

intercalary thirteenth month which is sometimes (e.g. ŚB. 12, 8, 2, 31; ŚāṅkhB. 5, 8) described as identical with the year itself. This month is also identified with the sun (= the year). See besides JB. 1, 50 also VādhS. 4, 97^b (A.O. 6, p. 217) *sa u vā eṣa eva trayodaśo māso yad asāv ādityas. tasmād asāv ādityaḥ sarveṣāṃ bhūtānāṃ prajānanasya rūpam* (note the connection between procreation, sun and upamāsa). In KauṣU. the reading *jāya* (instead of *upajāya*) is against the metre. Bhattacharya's emendation *sa jāyāyā upajāyamāna* (o.c., p. 3) is no improvement. Read with Frenz *sa upajāya upajāyamāno* in KauṣU. and JB.

²⁵ The instrumental *dvādaśena* (the twelvefold year; the reading *trayodaśena* of JB. 1, 50 seems to be less original) refers to the year as the real father (the earthly father being only a *karṭṛ*) by which man is produced and should be taken with *upajāyamāno*. Frenz incorrectly renders "zusammen mit dem Zwölfteligen".

²⁶ Read *sam* (instead of *samam*) *tad vide prati tad vide* in accordance with the parallel passages. Almost all translators since Böhtlingk have derived *vide* from *vid-* "to know". Geldner, o.c., p. 142 translates: "Mit dem zwölf oder dreizehn (Monate) zählendem Vater weiss ich mich jetzt eins, dessem bin ich mir wieder bewusst". This translation is not possible in JB. Thieme derives *vide* from *vid-* "to find" (o.c., p. 26). For a criticism of this interpretation see "Der Vers *vicaḥṣaṇād* . . .", o.c., p. 847. See also A.O. 6, p. 150 and JUB. 1, 14, 4, 3 on *samprativid-*.

²⁷ With this line (the correct reading of which was established by Raghu Vira) ends the verse consisting of two triṣṭubh stanzas of which the first two pādas count twelve instead of eleven syllables.

²⁸ Oertel, followed by Windisch, Hertel and Frenz, needlessly changes *vidvāmsam* and *jānanam* into *avidvāmsam* and *ajānanam* disregarding the evidence of the mss. The soul is not ignorant, as is stated JB. 1, 50 *sa haṣa na manuṣyo ya evaṃ veda*. In Oertel's interpretation an insignificant detail would be expressed with too much stress. The point is that the soul has been accepted by the seasons as one of them, as one who knows his identity with the Year, as an initiated who has given the correct password. Veda Vyasa was right in rejecting the conjectures.

²⁹ The passage from here to "He approaches that essence of good deeds" occurs also JUB. 3, 3, 4, 1-6.

³⁰ The sacrificer had made himself a second Self in the sun by offering in the āhavanīya fire, as was stated at 1, 17. Cf. also ŚB. 11, 2, 2, 6 *atha yām etām āhutiṃ juhōti, eṣā ha vā asyāhutiṃ amuṣmim loka ātmā bhavati*. Windisch, o.c., p. 127 compares JUB. 3, 5, 1, 7 ff., where the soul collects the constituents of the body from several divinities. Nowhere, however, is it stated that one receives back what has been offered. Moreover, in the passage of JUB. one asks for the parts of the body, whereas in JB. the sun throws out the ātman because the deceased is not qualified to stay in the sun. The two passages have no relation at all. Because admission to the sun depends on the knowledge of one's identity with the sun, one's name (i.e. individuality) should not be mentioned. A. Coomaraswamy, "Ākimcañña: Self-naughting", *N.I.A.* 3, p. 7 too much stresses the anonymity and even adduces the Homeric story of Ulysses and Polyphemus for elucidating this passage.

³¹ Oertel, o.c., p. 116 reading with two mss. *pratipattam* translates "Him having hastened into this self, when about to escape the seasons grasping his foot, drag away". Windisch emends *pratipatta* to *pratipanna* and renders "Nachdem dieses Selbst eingetreten ist, ziehen die Ṛtus den am Fusse gepackten fort, indem sie davon eilen" (o.c., p. 127). According to him and

Renou, o.c., p. 24, n. 2 the motif of running away occurs also KauṣU. 1, 4 and 5. The relation to these passages is very doubtful since there is no reason why the seasons should run away. The compounds of *palāyati* do not invariably refer to running away. See JB. 3, 146; A.O. 4, p. 40; 6, p. 232 and Oertel, *Trans. Conn. Acad. Arts & Sc.* 15, p. 172, who refers to *Petr. Dict., Nachträge* I, p. 298 a. Here the seasons run towards the deceased after he has got back his ātman (loc. abs.; read *pratipanna*) and draw him away. The compound *padgrhitam* may contain a reference to the *padbīsa* by which the dead are fettered. See L. Scherman, *Visionslitteratur*, p. 154 on Yama's "Fussfessel".

³² Coomaraswamy's rendering, *N.I.A.* 3, p. 7 "Who I am is the light thou art" is untenable. The soul does not directly identify itself with the sun, but interpreting the question *has tvam asi* as the statement "you are *ha* (= Prajāpati)" he shows that he has understood the speech of the sun. One should not assume with Hertel, o.c., p. 153, n. 1 that the sun is tricked. Idle word-plays and jokes do not occur in eschatological texts.

³³ Hertel, o.c., p. 153 incorrectly takes *svar* as subject: "Darum bin ich, der Himmel, zu dir, dem dem Himmel gehörigen, gekommen". See also Frenz, o.c., p. 127: "Soeben bin ich als Strahlender zu dir, dem Strahlenden, gekommen". The soul (= *ha*, Prajāpati) has gone (*agām*) to the sun (*suvar*). The adjective *svargya* stresses the identity of *suvar* and *svarga*, which is also expressed by the etymological figure *svar agām*. In the next sentence the identification of the deceased with the sun is completed, as *suvarga* means heaven or sun as well as "going to heaven". See also AV. 10, 2, 31 (*svarga* = "heaven going").

³⁴ Compare KauṣU. 1, 6 *yas tvam asi so 'ham asmi*, spoken to Brahmā by the soul.

³⁵ Windisch, o.c., p. 128 compares this and the next sentence to KauṣU. 1, 4 *sa āgacchati vijarām nadīm. tām manasaivātyeti. tat sukṛtaduṣkṛte dhunute. tasya priyā jñātayah sukṛtam upayanty apriyā duṣkṛtam*. With his view, that *apyeti* of JB. 1, 18 corresponds to *atyeti*, and *sukṛtarasa* to the river Vijarā, I do not agree. It is true that at KauṣU. 1, 4 some mss. have *apyeti* (*sa āgacchaty āram hradam. tam manasāpyeti, v.l. atyeti*), but even if *apyeti* would be the correct reading, we should not with Renou, o.c., p. 22 translate "Il arrive au lac Āra et le traverse", since *apyeti* does not mean "to pass". The mythical description of the path to the highest god of KauṣU. has no equivalent in JB. 1, 18. JUB. 3, 3, 4, 6 (*sa etam eva sukṛtarasam praviṣati*) does not refer to passing a mythical stream or reaching a mythical place. There *sukṛtarasa* seems to designate the food which has been stored up by the sacrificer in the moon, even as for an embryo food has been stored up in the breasts of the mother. As the child drinks the milk after its birth so the sacrificer who is reborn in the sun drinks the essence of his good deeds out of the moon. Compare TB. 3, 10, 11, 3, where the good deeds are likewise regarded as drinkable. For *sukṛtarasaḥ* compare JUB. 1, 9, 3, 4 *atha yat para atibhāti sa puṇyākṛtyāyai rasah*.

³⁶ Cf. JB. 1, 50; KauṣU. 1, 4 and Ghosh, *Lost Brāhmaṇas*, p. 97.

19-20. Discussion between Janaka and Yājñavalkya on the substitutes for the normal oblation. Truth is offered in śraddhā. The mental performance and the offering in the prāṇa during the pravāsa

For this section see Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 23, p. 328 ff., who draws attention to the corresponding passage of ŚB. in the Mādhy. recension (11, 3, 1, 1-8). Caland, "Over en uit het Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa", *Amsterdam Acad.* 1915, p. 33 compares the beginning of this section to the Kāṇva recension (3, 1, 4), which more agrees with JB. than the Mādhy. version. The rest of the passage (with the discussion between Janaka and Yājñavalkya, of which another version is found VādhS. 3, 40, *A.O.* 4, p. 35), however, is more consonant with the Mādhy. recension. See Caland's introduction to his ŚBK. edition (Lahore 1926), p. 102. However, the differences between the two versions are not great in this part. They mostly concern the expression, e.g. *abhaviṣyat* (K.) / *syāt* (M.), rather than the contents. In these cases JB. again agrees with ŚBK. at the end of the discussion, where the Kāṇvas read *sa hovāca namas te 'stu yājñavalkya vetthāgniho- tram sahasraṃ dadāmiti* (cf. JB. *taṃ hovāca vetthāgniho- tram yājña- valkyā. namas te 'stu. sahasraṃ bhagavo dadma iti*; ŚBM. *vetthāgniho- tram yājñavalkya dhenuśatam dadāmiti hovāca*). On the relation between the two ŚB. recensions and JB. Caland observes in the introduction to the ŚBK. edition p. 101 that ŚB. 1-5 and ŚBK. 1-7 are younger than JB., whereas the later books of ŚB. "— at least parts of book XI and XII (M.) — seem rather to have been known to the Jaiminīyas". These different relationships are not only based on the fact that ŚB. consists of different layers. One should also take into account that those correspond- ing passages which exhibit borrowing by JB. from ŚB. are found in the agnihotra section (JB. 1, 1-65) which may be regarded as a later addition. Most likely the present section is later than ŚB. in both recensions. In the introductory passage before the actual discussion both ŚB. versions pre- pare the conclusion of the debate (*satyam* is offered in *śraddhā*) by equating *tejas* (the flame of the fire) with *śraddhā* and *ājyam* (the oblatory butter) with *satyam*. ŚBK. even explains the latter homology: *satyena hime lokā ājityāḥ*. ŚBM. omits this (and for that matter looks like an abridgement of the ŚBK. introduction to the debate). JB. even omits these essential equations and thereby removes the connecting element between the introductory passage and the discussion. The introduction is entirely missing in the VādhS. version, for obvious reasons since this text has a macrocosmic substitute (the sun) instead of the microcosmic (truth). On the secondary character of this parallel version see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.* V, n. 8.

After the discussion some ślokas follow with a connecting and explana- tory prose context. ŚB. 11, 3, 1, 5 introduces this originally independent passage (dealing with a different kind of substitution) with *tad apy ete ślokāḥ*, whereas JB. trying to connect the two passages more closely

makes Janaka sing the interrogatory verses (*atha hainam upajagau*) and Yājñavalkya (specified as the Vājasaneya, which also points to bor- rowing from ŚB.) the responsive verses. According to P. Horsch, *Die vedische Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur* (Bern 1966), p. 112 the verses of the ŚB. version are "wohl jünger". This view (presumably based on the announcement *tad apy ete ślokāḥ*) does not convince me. Observe that JB. mostly uses the phrase *tasyaiṣa ślokaḥ* and only here (in the younger agnihotra section) has *atha hainam upajagau*.

For the interpretation of the contents of this section I may refer to *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.* V B.

19. The agnihotra cow indeed is speech.¹ Her calf is mind. They milk speech whose milk has been caused to flow² by mind. They milk the mother (cow) whose milk has been caused to flow by her calf. This mind here which comes first³ is followed by speech. There- fore the mother (cow) runs after the calf that walks in front. The milkpost⁴ is the heart, the rope is breath. With breath indeed speech and mind are tied up (to the heart). With a rope he ties up the calf and the mother (to the milkpost).

Now as to this Janaka (the king) of Videha asked Yājñavalkya: "Do you know the agnihotra (oblation), Yājñavalkya?" "I do" he said. "What is it?" "Milk". "If there would be no milk, with what would you perform the offering?" "With rice and barley". "If there would be no rice and barley, with what would you perform the offering?" "With any other corn". "If there would not be any other corn, with what would you perform the offering?" "With forest herbs". "If there would be no forest herbs, with what would you perform the offering?" "With water". "If there would be no water, with what would you perform the offering?" He said: "Then, indeed, there would be nothing at all here, and yet there would be offered⁵ here, namely, truth in faith". To him he spoke: "You know the agnihotra, Yājñavalkya. Honour to you. A thousand (cows) we give to you, Sir".

Then he recited to him (the verse):

"Does the agnihotrin who stays away from his house have knowledge (of his agnihotra at home?)?"⁶

20. — How is there religious inspiration⁷ for him in that case? How does he remain connected with (his) fires?" (This means:) "When having established his fires he thereupon leaves home, how is there no leaving home then?" Vājasaneya said:

"He who is the quickest among the beings, is found to be the one that knows (i.e. keeps being aware of his agnihotra) while staying abroad. Thus there is religious inspiration for him then. Thus he remains connected with (his) fires".

Mind he meant by saying that. Mind certainly is the quickest⁸ among the beings. "Mentally⁹ there is no leaving home for him" he thereby meant to say.

Then he recited to him:

"When he makes a long journey and then neglects his duty (of performing a mental agnihotra) there, in what is that oblation offered by him which they keep offering for him at home?"¹⁰

Vājasaneyā said:

"He who wakes in the beings is found to be the one that knows while staying abroad.¹¹ In him that oblation is offered by him which they keep offering for him at home".

Breath he meant by saying that. Breath wakes in the beings.¹² In breath that oblation is offered by him. Therefore they say: "The agnihotra is breath". For as long as he breathes with breath so long he offers the agnihotra.¹³

NOTES

¹ JUB. 2, 5, 1, 3 (in an entirely different context) speech is likewise described as a cow: *tām etām vācam yathā dhenum vatsenopasyjya prattām dūhitaivam eva devā vācam sarvān kāmān aduhran*.

² With Oertel, o.c., p. 328 and Caland, o.c., p. 33 one should read *prattām* instead of *prktām*. See also Hoffmann, "Textkritisches zum Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa", I.I.J. 4, p. 7. For parallels see Oertel, J.V.S. I, p. 163 f.

³ Caland, "Emendationen zum Jaiminiya-brāhmaṇa", W.Z.K.M. 28 (1914), p. 62 f. changes Oertel's *tatpascā* into *yat pascā* and translates "In dieser Weise, fürwahr, folgt die Stimme dem vorangehenden Geiste". So *pūrvam yat* (see also ŚBK. 3, 1, 4) corresponds to *pūrvam yantam* in the next sentence. Raghu Vira reads *yat* but seems to have a different interpretation, as appears from his punctuation. Probably he takes *yat* as a conjunction and not as a participle. Compare JB. 1, 329; ŚB. 3, 2, 4, 11 and PB. 11, 1, 3 on mind preceding speech.

⁴ For *methy* (*upadohani*) (not *medhy* as Oertel reads) see PB. 13, 9, 17 (with Caland's note on his translation).

⁵ Oertel, o.c., p. 329 conjectures *ahūyataiva* (the reading of ŚB.), whereas Raghu Vira reads *u hūyata iva*. VādhS. has *āhūyata iva*. Here *iva* ("as it were") may be preferable in view of the unusualness of the offering, but after *āsīd* one does not expect a present tense.

⁶ Eggeiling translates the ŚB. parallel "Knowing what, does the offerer of the Agnihotra stay away from his house". Similarly Horsch, o.c., p. 112 ("Was wissend..."). The exact interpretation remains doubtful, but so

much is clear that in the responsive verse no answer is given to a question "Knowing what...". In the answer *sa vidvān pravasan* refers back to *vidvān pravasati*. This does not appear from Eggeiling's and Horsch' translations. Presumably *him svid* only introduces a question.

⁷ According to Horsch, o.c., p. 112 *kāvya* here should mean "Kunstgriff". This interpretation does not strike me as very suitable in the context, since the mental performance of the agnihotra, to which this verse seems to refer, hardly can be called an artifice.

⁸ Cf. RV. 6, 9, 5.

⁹ On the mental performance during the *pravāsa* see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. IV and V, n. 10. Mind being the swiftest, one is able to cross a long distance and mentally be present at the agnihotra which is performed at home if one does not miss the mental agnihotra abroad. Probably *vidvān* and *kāvya* in the verse refer to the consciousness, the awareness of the sacrificer who every morning and evening has full knowledge of what is going on with his fires (i.e. his second self, his vital powers or breaths) at home.

¹⁰ This verse (= ŚB. 11, 3, 1, 7) was completely misunderstood by Eggeiling. See *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. V, n. 12 for Minard's criticism and likewise wrong interpretation. Horsch, o.c., p. 113 correctly interprets the contents of the verse, but is wrong in taking *ātha tātra pramādyati* (accent!!) as a principal clause.

¹¹ *sa vidvān pravasan vide* is out of place here. ŚB. 11, 3, 1, 8 has *viśvā jatāni yo bibhah*. Again an indication that JB. is not the source of ŚB.

¹² Read with Veda Vyasa *prāṇo vāva* (cf. *mano vāva*) *bhuvaneṣu*.

¹³ On this agnihotra in the *prāṇa* which is different from the *prāṇāgnihotra* rite see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. V.

21. The seventeenfold vaiśvadeva-agnihotra. The sthānu in the agnihotra

JB. takes together two different subjects in this chapter. The second paragraph only deals with the *sthānu* of the agnihotra (for this subject see KS. 6, 5: 54. 8 f.; KapS. 4, 4; MS. 1, 8, 5: 121. 4 f.; TB. 2, 1, 4, 3 and VādhS. 3, 33, A.O. 4, p. 30), but the final sentence again refers to the seventeenfold agnihotra of the first paragraph.

The text of the first part of this section is very corrupt in the critical edition. The brāhmaṇa mentions a seventeenfold agnihotra, whereas only thirteen stages of the agnihotra milk are found in the edited text. It is worthwhile to attempt a reconstruction of the original text since the critical apparatus contains some obviously correct readings and several parallels are found in other texts. The closest parallel VādhS. 3, 37 (A.O. 4, p. 32), an *anvākhyāna* of TB. 2, 1, 7, 1, is used as starting-point in the following outline, which further includes AB. 5, 26, 6-8 (explicitly referring to a sixteenfold agnihotra); MS. 1, 8, 10 and KŚS. 25, 2, 3. The remoter parallels ŚB. 11, 5, 3, 5 and GB. 1, 3, 12 are left out of account in this outline. The left series mentions the stages of the milk; the right the dedication to the deities. The numbers in each column refer to these two series and their order in the text. The second column of JB. contains the version of the ms. *ya* (probably the Baroda ms.), which the editor strange enough has not preferred to the lacunary version of the Burnell mss.

VādhS.	AB.	MS.	KŚS.	JB.	JB. ²	VādhS.
1 gavi (sat)	1/1	1/1	1/1	1/1		raudram
2 upasr̥ṣṭam (upāvasr̥ṣṭam)	2/2	2/2	2/2	2/2		vāyavyam
3 duhyamānam	3/3	3/3	3/3	3/3		āśvinam
4 dugdham	4/4	4/4	4/4	4/4		saumyam (JB. agniṣomi- yam)
5 adhiśritam	5/5	5/5	5/5	7/7		vāruṇam
6 bhindavaḥ (bindumat; JB. prendavaḥ)	8/8	7/19	8/12	5/9		vaiśvadevāḥ (vaiśvadevam)
7 (sam)udantam	6/6	8/8	6/6	-/5		pauṣṇam (JB. pauṣṇāḥ)
8 viṣyandamānam (viṣyaṇṇam)	7/-	9/9	7/8	—		sārasvatam
9 śaraḥ (śarogṛhitam) [pratiniyamānam]	9/9	6/6	-/9	6/6		maitram
	-/12	10/10	—	-/8		vaiṣṇavam]

VādhS.	AB.	MS.	KŚS.	JB.	JB. ²	VādhS.
10 udvāsitam (JB. pratiṣṭhāpya- mānam)	10/—	11/13	11/14	8/-		dhātuḥ (dhātram)
11 unnitam	—	13/—	13/13	9/-		bṛhaspateḥ (bārhaspatyam)
12 prakrāntam (MS. praṇiyamā- nam)	11/11	15/15	—/10	10/10		savituḥ (sāvitram)
13 (pra)hriyamānam	12/10	16/16	14/17	—/11	11/11	dyāvāpṛthi- v(i)yam (dyāvāpṛthi- vyoḥ)
14 upasannam	13/—	17/17	17/18	11/12	12/12	indrāgnam (indrāgnyoḥ)
15 pūrvāhutiḥ	14/14	—	18/—	12/—	13/13	agneḥ
16 uttarā	15/15	—/18	19/19	13/13	14/14	prajāpateḥ (prājāpatyam)
17 hutam	16/16	19/—	20/20	—	15/15	aīndram

Conclusions: Fifteen instead of thirteen items are obtained by following the ms. *ya* which perfectly agrees with the parallels (especially VādhS.). Compare also GB. *dyāvāpṛthivyam hriyamānam*. The same text also connects the first oblation with Agni. It is remarkable that KŚS. agrees with the corrupt, printed text of JB. (*dyāvāpṛthivyor upasannam indrāgnyoḥ pūrvāhutiḥ*). The sūtra, which does not follow its own brāhmaṇa, but MS. [*unnīyamānam* in twelfth position and other correspondences], AB. [*viṣyandamānam — mārutam* 7; see further the outline] and TB./VādhS. [*unnitam*], may have been influenced by an early corrupted version of the JB. mss. It should be noted that the agnihotra-vaiśvadevam was not always transmitted as a fixed, perfectly understood classification. Sometimes the order of either the left or the right column of our outline was rather automatically preserved, even where the sequence of the other was disturbed. Thus MS. 7 *mārutam* originally belonging to *bindumat* retains its seventh position in AB. and KŚS., but here refers to *viṣyandamānam*. KŚS. now connects *bindumat* (8) with *sārasvatam* (= TB./VādhS. 8 *viṣyandamānam*). If the irregular position of *maitram śarogṛhitam* (6) in MS. is corrected, even in this text *sārasvatam* (with *viṣyaṇṇam*) takes in the eight position. So one may assume one original scheme of equations and several successive corruptions and additions.

Now it is clear that one should start from the oldest passage and by means of agreements between the parallels try to restore the original order of the text. After the first five established items the reconstructed original text of MS. seems to be as follows: *mārutam bindumat* (6) [cf. TB./VādhS. for 6 *bindumat*] *pauṣṇam udantam* (7) [cf. TB./VādhS.] *sārasvatam viṣyaṇṇam* (8) [cf. TB./VādhS. and for 8 *sārasvatam* KŚS.]

maitram śarogṛhītam (9) [cf. TB./VādhS.; AB.; and for 9 *maitram* KŚS.]. Only *maitram śarogṛhītam* has been shifted from its sixth position in the text. Strikingly enough this item has the same sixth position in the text of JB. before our reconstruction. The new sequence represents the strictly chronological order of the process of boiling. The eight position of the bubbles in AB. and KŚS. cannot be original.

For the reconstruction of JB. (items 5-9) this implies the following hypothesis. In the correct text *maitram śaraḥ* (thus should be read instead of *maitraś*; see also the editor's "Studies in the JB.") forms the ninth instead of the sixth item and *vāruṇam adhiśritam* is fifth instead of seventh, as appears from the parallels. Moreover the position of *adhiśritam* is not in accordance with the chronological order ("put on the fire" *adhiśritam* and "taken from the fire" *pratiṣṭhāpyamānam* have been placed together). The text has preserved the following remains of the three missing items between *adhiśritam* (5) and *śaraḥ* (9): *pausnāḥ preṇḍavo*. It is significant that all parallels connect *pausnam* with *udantam* (or its v.l.). So we may safely infer that *pausnāḥ preṇḍavo* is corrupt. I propose as conjecture: *pausnam udantam* (6), *sārasvatam viśyandamānam* (7), *mārutāḥ bhiṇḍavo* (8). In the lacuna (one line of a mss.?) the missing items could be conjectured with a considerable amount of probability by comparing the parallels. The order is not entirely correct, but it is identical with AB. (items 6-8).

For JB. *vaiṣṇavam pratiṣṭhāpyamānam* (now nr. 10) compare, on the one hand, VādhS. and AB. *udvāsitam* (10) (= *pratiṣṭhāpyamānam*) and, on the other hand, MS. *vaiṣṇavam* (10). JB. *vaiṣvadevam unnītam* (now nr. 11; cf. VādhS. 11 *unnītam*) may be compared to ŚB. 11, 5, 3, 5.

As it is translated below the reconstructed text runs: *raudram gavi vāyavyam upasṛṣṭam āsvinaṁ duhyamānam agniśomīyam dugdham* (vāruṇam *adhiśritam*) *pausnam udantam sārasvatam viśyandamānam mārutāḥ bhiṇḍavo maitram śaro* [*vāruṇam *adhiśritam*]* *vaiṣṇavam pratiṣṭhāpyamānam vaiṣvadevam unnītam savituh prakrāntam dyāvāprthivyoh hriyamānam indrāgnyor upasannam agneh pūrvāhutih prajāpater uttarā aindram hutam*.

With regard to the relationships between the several versions the following observation may be made. The oldest version (MS.) is followed by TB. A special sixteenfold *vaiṣvadevam* is produced by AB. In an *anvā-khyāna* VādhS. makes the seventeenfold *vaiṣvadevam* of TB. into a special seventeenfold agnihotra (by way of response to AB. ?) and equates it with the vājapeya. JB. seems to borrow this passage from VādhS. as may appear from the fact that the explanation of the identification of vājapeya and agnihotra is missing and consequently their relation remains rather obscure. Moreover the passage on the *sthānu* which even in VādhS. is still independent seems to have been secondarily combined with the seventeenfold *vaiṣvadevam* by JB.

21. When in the cow it (sc. the agnihotra milk) is sacred to Rudra; when the cow is united with her calf¹ to Vāyu; when being

milked to the Aśvins; when milked to Agni and Soma; when put on the fire it is sacred to Varuṇa; when swelling up to Pūṣan; when overflowing to Sarasvatī. The bubbles are sacred to the Maruts; the film (on the boiling milk) is sacred to Mitra. When (the kettle with the milk) is put down on the earth² it (sc. the milk) is sacred to Viṣṇu; when ladled out to the All-gods. When (the officiant with the milk) has set out³ (towards the āhavanīya), it (sc. the milk) is sacred to Savitr; when being taken (to the āhavanīya) to Heaven and Earth; when put down upon (the grass)⁴ to Indra and Agni. The first oblation is sacred to Agni; the second to Prajāpati. When it (the milk) has been offered it is sacred to Indra. This is the agnihotra of seventeen parts. Seventeenfold is also the vājapeya. He who offers the agnihotra knowing thus wins both worlds, the world of the agnihotrin as well as that of the vājapeyin.

"There are three stumbling-blocks in the agnihotra",⁵ Śāṇḍilya used to say. Offering the oblation on the *samidh* while it has not blazed up forms a stumbling-block. Missing it (the *samidh*) is a stumbling-block. Mingling these two (oblations, by offering the second on the first) is a stumbling-block. One offers on the front part of the stick after it has blazed up.⁶ One offers the second oblation beyond (the first).⁷ He who knowing thus offers the agnihotra increases his prosperity seventeen thousand-fold each time.

NOTES

¹ According to Monier-Williams *upasṛṣṭa-* means "admitted (as the calf to its mother; also applied to the milk at the time of the calf's sucking)". Although indeed the calf is admitted to the cow, *upasṛṣṭa-* here refers either to the cow (*upasṛṣṭā*) or to the milk (*upasṛṣṭam*), but not to the calf. Just as *prakrāntam* designates the milk carried by the officiant when he is *prakrānta-* himself, so *upasṛṣṭam* seems to be the milk in the cow when she is *upasṛṣṭā*. Caland's translation *A.O.* 4, p. 32 "wenn hinzugelassen (d.h. wenn das Kalb zur Mutterkuh hinzugelassen wird, um die Milch ins Fließen zu bringen)" is not accurate. Presumably *upasṛṣṭā* is based on the construction *agnihotrim vatsenopasṛjati*. See e.g. JUB. 2, 5, 1, 3 .. *yathā dhenum vatsenopasṛjya prattām duhita*. The usual construction seems to be *vatsam upasṛjati*. See ĀpŚS. 6, 3, 10; HirŚS. 3, 7, 17; MŚS. 1, 6, 1, 14. ĀpŚS. has *vatsam upasṛjya* (6, 3, 10) besides *gām upasṛṣṭām* (6, 4, 4), whereas ŚB. 4, 6, 9, 9 construes *upasṛjati* with accusative and dative: *upasṛjan dharuṇam mātṛe* .. See, however, also ŚSS. 2, 8, 1 *agnihotrim upasṛjanti*. Anyhow *upasṛṣṭā* is the cow to which the calf has been admitted and not (as Eggeling takes it in ŚB. 1, 7, 1, 10) the cow who has been let loose to the calf.

² *pratiṣṭhāpyamānam*, here replacing *udvāsitam* or *udvāsyamānam*, does not occur in the parallel texts. It denotes the threefold resting of the kettle, which is pushed northward over the earth after being taken from the fire.

See BŚS. 20, 20: 43. 9 f. *trih pratiṣṭhāpayann ivodvāsayet. traya ime lokā. eṣu eva lokaṣu pratiṣṭhāti*. The connection with Viṣṇu (three steps!) is obvious. Cf. also ĀpŚS. 6, 6, 10.

³ Keith' unfelicitous translation of *prakrāntam* (AB. 5, 26, 6) "when it is ready (for the Hotṛ)" seems to be based on Sāyaṇa's commentary *prakrāntam hotuṃ haraṇāyopakrāntam*. There is no officiant called *hotṛ* in the agnihotra ritual. Here *prakrāntam* denotes the milk, when the *adhvaryu* has set out to the *āhavanīya*. Another term in this connection is *uddruta-*.

⁴ Keith renders *upasannam* (AB. 5, 26, 6) by "put (on the altar)". Cf. Sāyaṇa *vedyām āsāditam*. The agnihotrahāvani is, however, put west of the *āhavanīya* (ĀpŚS. 6, 8, 11; HirŚS. 3, 7, 59; BŚS. 3, 5, 15) or in the nearness (ĀśvŚS. 2, 3, 15) on grass. Caland's translation "wenn es in der Nähe (des *āhavanīya*) hingestellt ist" (A.O. 4, p. 32) is possible, but *upa* in this context perhaps means "upon" rather than "near". The ladle is put upon the grass. See ĀśvŚS. 2, 3, 15 *kuṣeṣūpasādyā*; HirŚS. 3, 7, 59 *oṣadhīṣūpasādayati*; BŚS. 3, 5, 15 *upasādayati kūrce*.

⁵ The parallel texts mentioned in the introduction refer to only one *sthānu*, the first oblation, which should be avoided when the second oblation is offered. The three *sthānus* of JB. may imply that this passage is rather late. The term *sthānu* in these contexts is often misunderstood. It is not a *mūla-stambha* (Sāyaṇa on TB. 2, 1, 4, 3), not a "Stein des Anstosses" (Petr. Dict.; Caland, A.O., 4, p. 30). A *sthānu* is an obstacle on one's way, here used figuratively, but originally in the form of a short stump upon which one's chariot might strike. Some western interpretators make the Vedic Indians run into pillars and posts, but apart from the fact that pillars probably were not so numerous as to be constantly struck, the image of an absent-minded person bumping his head against a pillar does not fit the context and chariots drawn by horses hardly run into pillars. The chariots and especially their wheels and axles strike upon obstacles like stumps (*sthānu*). As an obstacle for chariots *sthānu* occurs in the following places: RV. 10, 40, 13 *sthānum pathesṭhām* (Renou, E.V.P. 16, p. 73 "poteau (souche ici?) auquel se heurte le char en course"); AV. 10, 4, 1 *ratha sthānum ārad athārṣat* (Whitney "... hath run against the pillar"); TS. 7, 3, 1, 1 *prajavam vā etena yanti yad daśamam ahaḥ* (...) *yo vai prajavam yatām apathena pratipadyate ya sthānum hanti yo bhreṣam nyeti sa hīyate* (Keith "post"). The parallel JB. 3, 303 *ājīm vā ete yanti ya etad ahar āgacchanti. teṣām eṣa hīyate ya upahanyate* proves that *sthānu* in the TS. passage is an obstacle for chariots, and that *upahanyate* presumably is on a level with *sthānum hanti*. Figuratively *upahanyate* perhaps means "to make a failure" [see Caland's n. on PB. 15, 7, 4; Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 299 and Lokesh Chandra's n. on JB. 2, 40 (*Gavāmayana*); Petr. Dict. "anstossen, stecken bleiben im Rezitieren"], but the original meaning seems to be "to strike upon an obstacle with a chariot and become stuck". In Keith' translation of the TS. passage "left out" (*hīyate*) should be changed into "left behind". See also JB. 1, 329 *hīyamānam* (likewise in the context of a race). ŚāṅkhB. 26, 4 (Keith "pillar") and JUB. 3, 3, 5 (Oertel "post") refer to obstacles for chariots. The *sthānu* may be an insidious obstacle on one's way, a stump, which like a pit may be fatal for a man who is driving his chariot at full speed on rough ground. The *sthānu* of the agnihotra is either an obstacle for the sacrifice (cf. TB. 2, 1, 4, 1 *yajñasthānu*), or it is a dangerous obstacle (figuratively: a failure) for the sacrificer: *mṛtyur ha vā agnihotrasya sthānuḥ* (VādhS., A.O. 4, p. 30); cf. AB. 3, 14, 3 *sarvān pāsān sarvān sthānūn mṛtyor atimucya*. In the present passage there is not only an almost concrete stumbling-block represented by the first oblation on which

the second may strike, but another cause for a shipwreck (in the terms of another metaphor) may be the fact that one does not pour the oblation on the *samidh* or pours it on a *samidh* which has not flamed up. See Śaṅkara's commentary on Vedāntasūtra 1, 3, 30 (quoted by Kane, *Hist. of Dharmas*. II, p. 356) dealing with the fatal use of mantras without knowledge of their ṛṣi, deity and *vinīyoga*: one strikes on a stump or falls in a pit (which is of course only dangerous for people driving at full speed). See also JB. 1, 114 on safely passing a dangerous *yajñasthānu*.

⁶ *ādīptāyai samidhas samunmukhe juhoti*. Compare BŚS. 3, 6: 74. 20 *tasyām ādīptāyām pratimukham juhoty* .. wrongly translated "After the fire-stick is well kindled, he should offer the oblation through the beak of the ladle ..." (*Srautakośa* I, p. 92). Dumont, *L'Agnihotra*, p. 126 renders *pratimukham* by "se tenant en face". As appears from the other sūtras, the first oblation has to be offered at a distance of two *āṅgulas* from the *mūla* of the *samidh*, i.e. on the front part. The second is offered behind this frontal part. Does *samunmukhe* here stand for *saṃmukhe*?

⁷ Read *atihāya* for *etiḥāya*. Its object *pūrvām āhutim* has to be supplied. Cf. HirŚS. 3, 7, 74 *atihāya tūṣṇīm uttarām samidhi bhūyasīm juhoti*; BŚS. 3, 6: 75. 6 f. *atihāya pūrvām āhutim uttarām bhūyaḥ samidhy eva juhoti*. Cf. also BhārŚS. 6, 12, 10; VaiŚS. 2, 4.

22-25. Discussion between Janaka and five brahmins on the agnihotra. The sun (= yaśas, satyam . . gati) is offered in the fire (= yaśas, satyam . . iti) and conversely

This section was edited and translated by Caland, *JB. Auswahl*, p. 9 ff., who observes (p. 13): "Das ganze Stück erinnert in seinem Aufbau an Chānd. up. V. 11 flgg.". Indeed the composition of that passage (of which an earlier version is found ŚB. 10, 6, 1) is similar. Six brahmins visit a kṣatriya in order to have a discussion with him. On the dominant role of the kṣatriyas in these discussions, especially in connection with the agnihotra, see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. II. The subject of the dispute at ChU, 5, 11 is, however, completely different. It compares better with ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 1 ff., where Janaka meets some travelling brahmins and also discusses the agnihotra. Although some motifs in that passage and in the present section are the same (e.g. the offering of the sun in the fire and conversely) there are too many differences which exclude a connection of both passages with a common source.

On the basic theme of the discussion, the offering of sun in fire and fire in sun, see section 9-10 (especially n. 2) and *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. V A and C.

22. Āruṇi, Vājasaneya, Barku Vārṣṇa, Priya Jānaśruteya and Buḍila Āśvatarāśvi Vaiyāghrapadya, these¹ were five great brahmins. They (once) said: "Janaka, that king of Videha, is well-informed about the agnihotra. He considers himself superior to us in the dispute. Come, we shall make him discuss² the agnihotra".

They arrived there. They said to the pupil³ (who received them): "Announce us".⁴ He announced them. For them, after they had been announced⁵ (to him), he (sc. the king) prepared separate seats, separate (dishes of) water, separate *madhuparka* drinks, separate⁶ abodes, (in short he prepared) the five⁷ obeisances separately to (each of) the five.

Then he went to have a meeting with them⁸ having shaved the hair of his head and his beard, having cut his nails and anointed his eyes and body, carrying a staff and wearing sandals.⁸ He said to them: "Brahmins, how is it that you have invited us for a discussion?"⁹ "You out-talk us".¹⁰

Then he took the initiative¹¹ and asked them: "Brahmins, how do you offer the agnihotra?" "You have indeed (again) out-talked us",¹⁰ they said, "since you have taken the initiative and questioned us who are more than one. Gautama,¹² answer".

23. He said: "As honour, O king, I offer the agnihotra. Therefore I am honour. Honour certainly there will be in my progeny in the end". To him he said: "What is honour, Gautama?" Pointing at the fire he said:¹³ "This is honour" and at the sun: "That is honour. So I offer that honour in this honour in the evening and this honour in that honour at dawn."¹⁴ These two will lead me thither where are all things one may desire.¹⁵ These two will ward off repeated dying for me". "Well-offered! I must gratify you, gentlemen",¹⁶ thus he praised.

Then he asked the second: "How do you offer the agnihotra?" He, Vājasaneya, said: "As truth, O king, I offer the agnihotra. Therefore I am truth. Therefore I am reputed as a speaker of truth".¹⁷ To him he said: "Yājñavalkya, what is truth?" Pointing at the fire he said: "This is truth" and at the sun: "That is truth. So I offer that truth in this truth in the evening and this truth in that truth at dawn. These two will lead me thither where are all things one may desire. These two will ward off repeated dying for me". "Well-offered! I must gratify you, gentlemen", thus he praised.

Then he asked the next one: "How do you offer the agnihotra?"

24. He, Barku¹⁸ Vārṣṇa, said: "As the largest (and) best of all properties, O king, I offer the agnihotra, Therefore I am the largest (and) best of all properties. Certainly the largest (and) best of all properties will be in my progeny in the end". To him he said: "Agniveśya, what is the largest (and) best of all properties?" Pointing at the fire he said: "This is the largest (and) best of all properties" and at the sun: "That is the largest (and) best of all properties. So I offer that largest (and) best of all properties in this largest (and) best of all properties in the evening and this largest (and) best of all properties in that largest (and) best of all properties at dawn. These two will lead me thither where are all things one may desire. These two will ward off repeated dying for me". "Well-offered! I must gratify you, gentlemen" thus he praised.

Then he asked the next one: "How do you offer the agnihotra?" He, Priya Jānaśruteya, said: "As brilliance, O king, I offer the agnihotra. Therefore I am brilliance. Brilliance certainly there will be in my progeny in the end". To him he said: "Kāṇḍviya,¹⁹ what is brilliance?" Pointing at the fire he said: "This is brilliance" and at the sun: "That is brilliance. So I offer that brilliance in this brilliance in the evening and this brilliance in that brilliance at dawn. These two will lead me thither where are all things one may desire. These

two will ward off repeated dying for me". "Well-offered! I must gratify you, gentlemen" thus he praised.

Then he asked the next one: "How do you offer the agnihotra?"

25. He, Buḍila Āsvatarāśvi Vaiyāghrapadya, said: "As the *arka* and the *aśvamedha*,²⁰ O king, I offer the agnihotra. For the *arka* and the sacrificially pure horse of the *aśvamedha* sacrifice are the food of the gods". To him he said: "Vaiyāghrapadya, what is the *arka*, what is the sacrificially pure horse of the *aśvamedha* sacrifice?" Pointing at the fire he said: "This is the *arka*" and at the sun: "That is the sacrificially pure horse of the *aśvamedha* sacrifice. So I offer that sacrificially pure horse of the *aśvamedha* sacrifice in this *arka* in the evening and this *arka* in that sacrificially pure horse of the *aśvamedha* sacrifice at dawn. These two will lead me thither where are all things one may desire. These two will ward off repeated dying for me". "Well-offered!", having thus praised, he said: "Assuredly, to him who might tell me what are the goal and the means for coming there²¹ in the agnihotra I should like to grant a boon". They said: "We have not studied the goal and the means for coming there in the agnihotra. You must tell us the goal and the means for coming there in the agnihotra. We separately grant you five boons (i.e. each of us will grant you a boon)". Pointing at the fire he said: "This is the means for coming there" and at the sun: "That is the goal. So I offer that goal in this means for coming there in the evening and this means for coming there in that goal at dawn. These two will lead me thither where are all things one may desire. These two will ward off repeated dying for me". "Well-offered!" thus having praised they said: "Choose the boons we have granted". He said: "This is my choice: Let me give you separately (i.e. each of you) thousand (cows) and five hundred horses".

These were the reflections²² on the agnihotra, these were the aims. These very aims he obtains who knows thus and for whom (a priest) knowing thus performs the agnihotra.²³

NOTES

¹ The series of names, nominatives resumed by the pronoun *ete* (Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 22) is concluded by the "comprehensive" *iti* (Oertel, o.c., p. 11). Āruṇi, usually called Uddālaka Āruṇi, is frequently mentioned in ŚB. and JB., but also in other texts. Vājasaneyā occurs as Yājñavalkya only in ŚB. and JB. (except twice in Śāṅkhā. in passages borrowed from ŚB.). As Vājasaneyā he is mentioned in JB. and BĀU. Barku Vārṣṇa appears ŚB. 1, 1, 10; BĀU. (M.) 4, 1, 8 and JB. 1, 248, where Raghu Vira without giving

a v.l. reads *prakur vārṣṇas* against Caland, JB. *Auswahl*, p. 96 *barkur* (conj. for *prakur*) *vārṣṇis*. See also Jaiminīyanyāyamālāvistara 6, 7, 15 (ed. Goldstücker, p. 295): Vārṣṇi. His third name Āgniveśya (see JB. 1, 24) is found in the lines of tradition (*vaṁśas*) of BĀU. Priya Jānaśruteya, addressed as Kāṇḍviya in 1, 24, does not occur elsewhere, but a Jānaśruteya is mentioned JB. 1, 219; 323; 2, 110; 207. Jānaśruteya is moreover the patronymic or metronymic of five brahmins, two of whom (Nagarin and Sāyaka) appear in the *vaṁśa* of JUB. 3, 7, 3, 2 ff. with their third name Kāṇḍviya. A Kāṇḍviya acts as an udgātṛ JUB. 3, 2, 5, 2. Buḍila Āsvatarāśvi Vaiyāghrapadya, frequently mentioned without his third name, is addressed as Vaiyāghrapadya ŚB. 10, 6, 1, 7 and ChU. 6, 16, 1. The appearance of king Janaka and the five brahmins, who often play a role in ŚB., shows that JB. and ŚB. have a common background even in instances where borrowing is out of the question.

² *eta tam agnihotre kathām vādayiṣyāma iti*. Cf. JUB. 4, 6, 1, 2 *etena kathām vādayiṣyāma iti*, where the mss. read *etatena* instead of *etena*. The correct reading seems to be *etatena*. For *kathā* meaning "discussion" see AĀ. 5, 3, 3 *nāsmīn kathām vadeta*, not to be translated with Keith "nor in this time should he tell tales". See also Horsch, *Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur*, p. 19, n. 1 referring for *kathā* ("philosophische Diskussion") to ChU. 1, 8, 1 and ĀśvGS. 4, 6, 6. Another term used in this connection is *saṃvāda* (Horsch, o.c., p. 19). See also n. 9 (*anusamvādayatha*).

³ Caland, o.c., p. 9 emending *brahmacāriṇam ūcuḥ* to *brahmacāriṇa ūcuḥ* translates "und sprachen (sich) als Schüler (bei ihm einstellend)". I retain with Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 306 *brahmacāriṇam*. His criticism, however, of Caland's interpretation that it would require *iti* and the middle voice of *vac-* is not justified since Caland did not take *brahmacāriṇa ūcuḥ* as meaning "they called themselves pupils". Raghu Vira and Veda Vyasa read with some mss. *brahmavādinam*, which can only refer to Janaka. The context, however, makes it clear that not Janaka himself, but his pupil is being addressed. That even kings sometimes had pupils, who were studying the Veda and doing other work, appears from JB. 2, 276 (JB. *Auswahl*, p. 194 ff.).

⁴ Caland, rendering *pra no brūhīti. tān ha provāca* by "'sage uns an'. Da sagte er ihnen an" and supplying "gastliche Bewirtung" as object, refers (o.c., p. 13, n. 8) to ŚB. 10, 6, 1, 2, where, however, *pravac-* is construed with a dative (*tebhyah*) and an accusative (object) and not with two accusatives (*tān* and the supplied "gastliche Bewirtung"). Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 306 rightly translates "announce us". Compare *prabrū-* (middle voice) meaning "to announce oneself" JB. 1, 18.

⁵ In *tebhyo ha proktebhyah* we find a concatenating use of the participle (Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 306 referring to Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 385). For the use of the demonstrative pronouns in initial position — *te hājagmus. te ha brahmacāriṇam ūcuḥ . . tān ha provāca. tebhyo ha proktebhyah . . (aiha haiśām . .) tān hovāca . . (aiha hainān . .) sa hovāca . . tam hovāca . .* see Thieme, *Wiss. Zs. Univ. Halle-Wittenberg* I, 3 (1951/52), p. 22, n. 1: "... das an die Spitze gestellte Demonstrativpronomen (*ta-*) erfüllt in stereotypischer Weise die Funktion einer anknüpfenden Partikel (*aiha, tatas*) + anaphorischem Pronomen (*a-, ena-*): Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax* 211 f.; Oldenberg, *Altind. Prosa* 20; Minard, *Subordination*, 80 ff."

⁶ Cf. ŚB. 10, 6, 1, 2 *tebhyo ha prithag āvasathān prithag apacitīḥ prithak sāhasrānt somān provāca*; ChU. 5, 11, 5 *tebhyo ha prāptebhyah prithag arhanām hārayām cakāra*; JUB. 4, 6, 1, 3 *tebhyo hābhyāgatebhyo pacitīḥ cakāra*.

⁷ There are five obseances, if *udaka-* is counted twice, *hastodaka-* and *pādodaka-* (Caland, o.c., p. 13, n. 9).

⁸ *atha haiṣām sabhāga āvavrājoptvā keśasmaśrūṇi nakhān nikṛtyājyābhyajya daṇḍopānaḥ bibhrat*. The same sentence is found JUB. 4, 6, 1, 4, where Oertel's conjecture *nikṛtyājyēnābhyajya* should be rejected (Caland, "Emendationen zum JB.", *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 75) and *sabhāga* should be read as one word. See Caland, who (o.c., p. 77) referring to ŚB. 3, 3, 4, 14 (*apy asya rājānaḥ sabhāgā āgacchanti*) proposes to read *sabhāgā* or *sabhāgāv* at JB. 1, 271 (*tau hārūṇer ācāryasya sabhāga ājagmatuḥ*). So *sabhāga* evidently is an adjective, as also appears from ChU. 5, 3, 6 *sa ha gautamo rājño 'rdham eyāya tasmai ha prāptiāyārhaṇam cakāra. sa ha prātaḥ sabhāga udeyāya*, not to be translated with Hume, *The thirteen principal Upanishads*, p. 232 "(...) Then on the morrow he went up to the audience-hall". Caland's later interpretation, JB. *Auswahl*, p. 11 "Darauf begab er sich (...) nach ihrem Aufenthaltsort" is not tenable. See Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 12 f., who is right in taking *sabhāga* everywhere as meaning "going for a conversation, discussion with somebody (genitive)". See also W. Rau, *Staat und Gesellschaft im alten Indien* (Wiesbaden 1957), p. 79 f., who interprets *sabhāga* as "zur sabhā gehend" and *sabhā* as "Gesellschaft bzw. Ort, wo vornehme Leute zu sprechen sind". For going to a *sabhā* compare JUB. 2, 4, 2, 14 *gacchati ha vā etām daivīm pariśadam daivīm sabhām daivīm samsadam ya evam veda*.

⁹ *kathā bhagavanto no 'nusaṃvādayatheti*. One of Raghu Vira's mss. and Caland's mss. read *no 'nusaṃpādayatheti* (tr. Caland: "wie vereinigt ihr euch zu uns?"), but the printed reading is preferable. Cf. KauṣU. 4, 3 *saṃvādayiṣṭhās*. Here *anu* may express the idea of "you one by one", i.e. "what are your respective motives for challenging me to a discussion?"

¹⁰ *ati no 'vādīr iti*, the answer revealing the reason of their visit, may be translated "you have been superior to us in disputing" or perhaps "you are superior to us in disputing". On this use of the aorist see Gonda, *The aspectual function of the Rgvedic present and aorist* (The Hague 1962), p. 59: "The aor. may even be chosen when the author deals with a process which on the one hand occurred regularly in the past and on the other hand continues to do so in the present. An example is RV. 1, 35, 10 *asthād devaḥ pratidoṣam* 'the god (= Savitar, the Sun) stands there in the evening' ('steht .. allabendlich da' Geldner)". Hoffmann, *Der Infinitiv im Veda*, p. 155 rightly speaks of "der konstatierende Gebrauch des Ind. Aor.". For a similar "Konstatierung" see ChU. 5, 3, 7 *tasmād u sarveṣu lokeṣu kṣatrasyaiva praśaṇanam abhūd iti*. In the next answer (*ati vai no 'vādīr iti*) the aorist seems to have its usual function of referring to the immediate or, rather, actual past (Hoffmann, o.c., p. 155: "Der konstatierende Gebrauch des Ind. Aor. ist mit Sicherheit nur dann fassbar, wenn der gemeinte Sachverhalt der ferneren Vergangenheit angehört"). Cf. ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 5 *ati vai no 'yam rājanyabandhur avādīd*. Caland, o.c., p. 11 translates "Du hast besser Bescheid gewusst als wir" and "Du hast wiederum versucht uns nieder zu schwätzen". As to its meaning it is to be observed that *ativad-* may express superiority without any specific relation to discussions. See e.g. KS. 21, 10: 50. 9 f.; TB. 1, 8, 3, 2 *tasmāt kṣatram viśam ativadati*. ŚaḍvB. 2, 3, 10 *tad u vidvāmsam āhur ati no 'vādīr iti* (tr. Bollée: "Others say to (an udgātar) who knows this observance: 'you have outvied us in the dispute'") hardly refers to debates. *ativad-* means also "to overpower, overtrump, surpass, eclipse, be superior", sometimes with an unfavourable connotation. See ŚaḍvB. 2, 3, 10 *ati no 'vādīr iti. tad anādrtyam*; ChU. 7, 15, 4 *sa vā eṣa evaṃ paśyan, evaṃ manvānaḥ, evaṃ vijānann ativādī bhavati. tam ced brūyuh ativādī asmiti brūyāt nāpahnūvīta*. Is this meaning based on *ativad-* "to sound louder, to produce more sound, to drown someone's voice, to dumbfound, to out-talk" rather

than on *ativad-* "to be superior in the dispute"? Cf. TB. 1, 3, 6, 2 *tasmād dundubhiḥ sarvā vāco 'tivadati*; JB. 1, 205 *na mānyā vāg ativadēd*. Renou, *I.C.* 14, p. 88 n. 1 regards *ativad-* ("prétendre) surpasser en parole") as "un terme typique du *brahmodya*". For a different view see Senart's note on ChU. 7, 15, 4.

¹¹ Taking the initiative in questioning seems to be advantageous. Janaka asks Yājñavalkya as a boon to be allowed to question him (*kāmapraśna eva me tvayi yājñavalkyāsad iti*). Therefore he may ask a question of Yājñavalkya at BĀU. 4, 3, 1 *sa ha kāmapraśnam eva vavre. tam hāsmāi dadau. tam ha samrād eva pūrvāḥ papraccha* although Yājñavalkya at first had not the intention of disputing: *sa mene na vadiṣya iti* (but perhaps one should read with Dvivedagaṅga *sa mena vadiṣya iti*; see also Renou, *I.C.* 14, p. 87, n. 1). Cf. ŚB. 11, 4, 1, 3 *ho 3 gautamasya putretītarāḥ pratiśuśrāva. tam ha tata eva praṣṭum dadhre* "Hullo, son of Gautama!" replied the other, and straightway began to question him" (tr. Eggeling). Questioning more persons on one subject offers the questioner the opportunity to show that the different views put forward are only partially correct and only refer to some aspects of the point at issue (cf. ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 4). The questioner is able to round off the conversation by expounding his own vision on the principal matter (as is done by the kṣatriya Āsvapati Kaikeya ŚB. 10, 6, 1, 10 ff. and ChU. 5, 18, 1 ff.). Observe how the kṣatriya Pravāhaṇa Jaivali likewise is a good tactician in the dispute at ChU. 1, 8, 1 ff. and lets the two brahmins talk first. In the present passage Janaka only takes advantage of his tactical position and hardly puts forward something new or important in overtrumping the brahmins.

¹² I.e. Āruṇi.

¹³ Read with Caland *upadiśann uvācedam*, since *upadiśan vācedam* (thus all mss. and the critical edition) makes no sense.

¹⁴ Cf. ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 2 *gharmāu eva samrād aham ājasrau yaśasā viṣyandamānāv anyonyasmin juhomi*.

¹⁵ Caland translates *yatra sarve kāmāḥ* "wo alle Wünsche (erfüllt werden)", but the assumption of an ellipsis is not necessary, since *kāma-* means also "object of desire, desired object".

¹⁶ *devān rādhayāni*. Caland, translating "Die Götter will ich zufriedenstellen", observes: "Ist *deva* etwa die ehrende Bezeichnung der Brahmanen?" (o.c., p. 16, n. 12). For *rādhayati* meaning "to compliment, to do honour to someone" see TB. 2, 1, 2, 9 (*Sāyaṇa: pūjayati*) and ŚB. (K.) 1, 4, 1, 5 *yo vai brāhmaṇam vā rājanyam vā śamsamāno 'nucarati grhān me kariṣyati yo vai tatra tam vācā vā karmāṇā vā rivādhayīṣati* . .

¹⁷ *tasmān mama satyam iva vadataḥ prakāśaḥ* "deshalb ist Helle (Berühmtheit) mein Besitz, weil ich die Wahrheit rede" (Caland). Here Caland seems to regard *iva* as equal to *eva* (on this use of *iva* see Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 15, n. 21), whereas he translates PB. 2, 8, 2; 3, 9, 2 *kṣatrasyevāsya prakāśo bhavati* by "A shining out among the nobility, as it were, falls to the share of him". Cf. PB. 19, 1, 5 "A 'shining-out' among the nobility falls to his share"; PB. 13, 4, 17; 15, 3, 31 "To his share falls the lustre of might". See also PB. 19, 17, 3 *brahmaṇa iva cāsya kṣatrasyeva ca prakāśo bhavati* "he . . becomes a shining-out amongst the priesthood and the nobility" and PB. 25, 15, 4 *ādityānām ivaiṣām prakāśo bhavati* "To their share falls the shining-out, as it were, of the Ādityas". So Caland seems to take *iva* sometimes as meaning "as it were" and sometimes as equal to *eva* in identical contexts. It is true that the Ānandāśrama edition reads PB. 13, 4, 17 *kṣatrasyaivāśya* (which would imply the identity of *iva* and *eva*), but Sāyaṇa bases himself on

the reading *iva* (*kṣatrasya kṣatriyajāter iva prakāśaḥ kīrttir bhavati*). The same commentator takes *iva* as a particle of comparison at PB. 19, 1, 5 and 19, 17, 3 (*yathā* ..) and this is the correct interpretation, as appears from JB. 1, 243 (*JB. Auswahl*, p. 95 f.) *brahmaṇo 'sya sataḥ kṣatrasyeva prakāśo bhavati vaiśyasyeva rayiḥ puṣtir ya evaṃ veda* "Wer solches weiss, der bekommt, obchon er Brahmane ist, Ansehen wie eines Kṣatriya, Reichtum und Gedeihen wie eines Vaiśya" (Caland). This interpretation should be applied in all the quoted parallels with .. *iva prakāśo bhavati*. In the present passage Yājñavalkya does not achieve fame on account of the fact that he speaks the truth, but by performing the agnihotra as a truth-sacrifice (on this see *Agn. a. Prāñagn.*, ch. V B) he becomes reputed as a *satyavādīn*, a truth-speaker who presumably replaces the actual performance of the agnihotra by his truth-practice. For a different interpretation of *iva* in this connection see D. Schrapel, *Untersuchung der Partikel iva und anderer lexikalisch-syntaktischer Probleme der vedischen Prosa* ... (thesis Marburg 1970), who arrives at the conclusion that "*iva* die Grundbedeutung 'kontingental' hat" (p. 81) and renders the discussed clause "Darum besitze ich, der ich (kontingental =) ausnahmslos die Wahrheit sage, weiten Ruhm" (p. 57).

¹⁸ Here and JB. 1, 22 as well as JB. 1, 248 (*JB. Auswahl*, p. 96) all mss. read *prakur* instead of *barkur*.

¹⁹ In view of JUB. 3, 2, 5, 2 and 3, 7, 3, 2 we should perhaps read *kāṇḍvīya* instead of *kāṇḍvīya*.

²⁰ *arkāśvamedhāu iti* .. "Als den Lichtstrahl und das Rossopfer .." (Caland). The multiplicity of its meanings make a translation of *arka*- difficult; the more so as often the ambiguity is intentional. See Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, p. 80 f. So much, however, seems to be certain that in the dvandva compound *arka*- does not mean "Lichtstrahl", but must have a ritualistic signification. Already AV. 11, 7, 7 *arkāśvamedhau* occurs in an enumeration of rites. See also TS. 2, 2, 7, 5 *indrāyārkavate 'śvamedhavate puroḍāśam ekādaśakapālam nirvaped yaṃ mahāyājñā nopanamed. ete vai mahāyājñasyāntye tānū yad arkāśvamedhāu* .. According to the *Petr. Dict.* and M.-W. *arka*- compounded with *śvamedha*- refers to a ceremony or rite. No *arka* rite being known from the ritualistic literature we had better follow Eggeling, *S.B.E.* 44, p. XVIII: "In the last two chapters of the 'Mystery of the Fire-altar' (Śat. B. X, 6, 4, 1; 4) the *Śvamedha* — i.e. the sacrificial horse itself — is coupled with the *Arka*, the mysterious name of the sacred fire, as the representative of Agni-Prajāpati, the Sun". See also P.-E. Dumont, *L'Śvamedha* (Paris 1927), p. 5 ff. That in the combination with the *Arka* *śvamedha*- is not the rite, but the victim appears from the present passage. Cf. also VādhS., *A.O.* 4, p. 173. For the equation of *arka*- with Agni and *śvamedha*- with the sun see TS. 5, 7, 5, 2; ŚB. 9, 4, 2, 18; 10, 6, 5, 8.

²¹ According to Caland *iti*- and *gati*- are "Gang und Bahn". In the present passage the *gati*- in the agnihotra is equal to the sun. Sometimes, however, this sun is considered to be the final goal (*gati*): ŚB. 1, 3, 5, 11 (= 11, 2, 6, 11) *eṣa evaīkaviṃśa ya eṣa tapati. saiṣā gatir eṣa pratiṣṭhā. tad etām gatim etām pratiṣṭhām gacchati*; ŚB. 1, 9, 3, 15 *atha sūryam udikṣate. saiṣā gatir eṣa pratiṣṭhā. tad etām gatim etām pratiṣṭhām gacchati*. In the conclusion of the parallel passage ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 1-4 Janaka informs Yājñavalkya: *na tv evainayos tvam utkrāntiṃ na gatim na pratiṣṭhām* (..) *na lokam pratyutthāyinaṃ* "But not even thou (knowest) either the uprising, or the progress, or the support, (..) or the renaissance world of those two (libations of the Agnihotra)" (Eggeling). Here, similarly, the *gati* is the goal to which one goes rather than the progress. On the *gati* and *pratiṣṭhā* in the agnihotra see also VādhS. 3,

36 (*A.O.* 4, p. 31). In the JB. passage Janaka does not fully describe the course of the agnihotra oblations (as in the *pañcāgnividyā* of ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 6-10), but using the argumentation of his opponents offers the *gati* (the goal of the oblation and the agnihotrin himself) in the *iti* (the means for coming there, the āhavanīya fire) and the *iti* in the *gati*.

²² *etāni vā agnihotra upāsānāni* "Das sind die Weisen, auf welche man beim Agnihotra Verehrung darbringt" (Caland). This section, however, does not deal with worship, but with mystic interpretations. On *upās*- see Gonda, *The Savayajñas* (Amsterdam 1965), p. 347 f. (giving references to previous interpretations) and Renou, *Presentation Volume C. Kunhan Raja* (Madras 1946), p. 55. One of the meanings of *upās*- is "to approach (mentally and reverentially) so as to regard as, to identify with etc." (Gonda, o.c., p. 348). Renou, *E.V.P.* 1, p. 98, n. 2 gives too much stress to the idea of making an equation in *upās*-. Frequently *upās*- has to be translated by "to consider to be .." without any reference to identifications. See e.g. ŚB. 10, 6, 2, 10 *sa yo haitam evam agnividham ukthavidham puruṣam upāste*; BĀU. 1, 4, 7 *sa yo 'ta ekaiḥ upāste*; 1, 4, 10 *atha yo 'nyām devatām upāste anyo 'sau anyo 'ham asmīti*; 1, 5, 13 *sa yo ha etān antavata upāste*; JB. 1, 271 *dhūrṣv evāham tad upāsa iti*. Making equations is not inherent in the original meaning of the verb *upās*-, but in the mind of the Vedic Indians, who always consider, regard, approach, stand towards (*upās*-) an object by means of (magic) equations. For the basic meaning of *upās*- see also ChU. 5, 24, 5 *yatheha kṣudhitā bālā mātaram paryupāsate, evaṃ sarvāṇi bhūtāny agnihotram upāsata iti* "Wie hier hungrige Kinder um die Mutter herumsitzen, so sitzen alle Wesen beim Agnihotra" (Horsch, *Vedische Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur*, p. 180). In this verse *upās*- should not be taken in its literal sense, but metaphorically: "to sit near with a definite intention or expectation; to stand towards in a definite way; to approach or look at; to consider". As to the present passage one may compare VādhS. 3, 39 (*A.O.* 4, p. 33 f.), where at the end of a discussion on the agnihotra Āruṇi observes: *evaṃ u ha yūyam upādhvā, atha ha vayam upāsmahe* ... Here Caland correctly translates *upās*- by "betrachten".

²³ Caland's rendering "der solches weiss und auch wer solches wissend das Agnihotra verrichtet" does not exactly reflect the Sanskrit (*ya evaṃ vedātho yasyaivaṃ vidvān agnihotram juhoti*).

26-38. The agnihotra of twelve days performed after the agnyādhāna

This section, which gives an interpretation of the twelve-day agnihotra to be performed after the agnyādhāna (during which the performer has to observe certain rules), seems to be completely original. There are no parallels in the other brāhmaṇas. Ch. 26-36 deal with the twelve days and their meaning. In ch. 37 the passing of this agnihotra from *brahman* and Prajāpati to the human beings has a remote parallel in VādhS. (see n. 34). Ch. 38 dividing the period in quarters (during three days milk as oblation, during three days *dadhan* etc.) makes four equations of the agnihotra with impressive rites like the *agniṣṭoma* and the *vājapeya*. These equations, which are very usual in the agnihotra brāhmaṇas (cf. also JB. I, 4), are continued or resumed in ch. 40 (with the same turns of phrase *tad vai . . rñpam, . . evāsyēṣṭam bhavati ya evaṃ vidvān . .*). The end of ch. 38 briefly describing the observance of twelve days (as it is mentioned in the sūtras) has a more or less exact parallel in ŚātB. (see n. 36). This might imply that the agnihotra section of JB. was also found in the parallel ŚātB., but the quotation (with the exception perhaps of the comparison *yathā suyavasān kṛtvā prājyāt*) makes a sūtra-like impression and may have belonged to a lost, old ŚātŚS. For the concise statements of the sūtras on these twelve days see BSS. 2, 20 (translated in *Śrautakośa* I, p. 55); BhārŚS. 5, 13, 5 ff.; ĀpŚS. 5, 22, 13 (and 5, 23, 3 quoting the Śātyāyanas); VārŚS. 1, 4, 4. These sūtras agree with JB./ŚātB., but do not mention the soma or victim oblation at the end of the period. According to VārŚS. one should offer clarified butter during those twelve days.

On JB. I, 26-29 see also D. J. Hoens, *Śānti* (thesis Utrecht 1951), p. 44 f., who makes some useful observations on the identifications of the gods with Death, but gives some unconvincing interpretations of the epithets of Death. It is imaginable that Death is pictured as "Licker" (the forest-fire) or "Devourer", but does *prabhūmat* mean "Coming forth" as epithet of Prajāpati-Death? "Srocan" (o.c., p. 44) seems to be based on a misreading of the text, which has *mrocan*. The setting sun is the dying sun which temporarily makes the whole world die.

26. Setting up his fires he should take out (a firebrand from the gārhapatya to the āhavanīya) at dawn. He offers his oblation twice in the evening, twice at dawn. This amounts to four oblations. Four feet have the domestic as well as the wild animals. Thus he redeems the being eaten by them in return.¹ Agni named the licking one, forsooth, is Death.² Having appeased him with these oblations he wins the earth among the worlds and the god Agni among the gods. To union with the god Agni and co-existence in his world³ he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

Then having mounted the chariot of smoke he drives up to co-existence with Vāyu. He offers during two days. This amounts to eight oblations. Eight hoofs have the domestic as well as the wild animals. Thus he redeems the being eaten by them in return. Vāyu named the swift one, forsooth, is Death. Having appeased him with these oblations he wins the atmosphere among the worlds and the god Vāyu among the gods. To union with the god Vāyu and co-existence in his world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

27. Then having mounted the chariot of the stormcloud he drives up to co-existence with Āditya. He offers during three days. This amounts to twelve oblations. Twelve months are a year. The year is this All (= the totality of the universe). What he eats, what he drinks, for whatever he opens his mouth, all that becomes uneaten by him;⁴ he becomes one who has undertaken the vow of abstaining from food during his whole life.⁵ Āditya named the setting one, forsooth, is Death. Having appeased him with these oblations he wins heaven among the worlds and the god Āditya among the gods. To union with the god Āditya and co-existence in his world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

28. Then having mounted the chariot of the rays of light he drives up to co-existence with Candramās.⁶ He offers during four days. This amounts to sixteen oblations. Sixteenfold is *brahman*.⁷ Sixteenfold are the gods. Of sixteen parts consists this complete All.⁸ When doing here an evil deed, (which is) dirt,⁹ he is covered over¹⁰ with one sixteenth part (of that dirt?). As a golden ornament¹¹ turns out to be (pure) gold when it is heated,¹² even so he goes to heaven having handed over the impurity of his evil to his hateful rivals.

¹³He is a hare¹⁴ (*śaśa-*) who is dwelling in the moon. For he controls (*śāsti*) all here. He is Yama who is dwelling in the moon. For he restrains (*yamayati*)¹⁵ all here. Yama named the one who will devour, forsooth, is Death.¹⁶ Having appeased him with these oblations he wins *ūrj*¹⁷ among the worlds and the god Yama among the gods.¹⁸ To union with the god Yama and co-existence in his world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

29. Then having embarked in the golden ship of the *svadhā* (= libation to the pitṛs)¹⁹ he steers towards co-existence with Prajāpati. He offers during five days. This amounts to twenty oblations. Connected with the number twenty²⁰ is Prajāpati. Prajāpati named

the powerful, forsooth, is Death. Having appeased him with these oblations he wins the atmosphere among the worlds and the god Prajāpati among the gods. To union with the god Prajāpati and co-existence in his world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

30. That which is called atmosphere (*nabhas*), that is absence of fear (*a-bhī*). For he who has reached that does not (*na*) fear (*bibheti*) of anything. Therefore it is (called) *nabhas*.²¹ He offers during six days. This amounts to twenty-four oblations. Of twenty-four syllables consists the *gāyatrī*. There are twenty-four Vasu-gods. They are connected with the *gāyatrī*.²² For these Vasu-gods the *gāyatrī* milks with every single syllable their wishes and desires.²³ In the same way it milks for this sacrificer. He wins the *gāyatrī* among the metres and the Vasu-gods among the gods. To union with the Vasu-gods and co-existence in their world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

31. He offers during seven days. This amounts to twenty-eight oblations. Of twenty-eight syllables consists the *uṣṇih*. There are twenty-eight Bhṛgu- and Āṅgīrasa-gods.²⁴ They are connected with the *uṣṇih*.²⁵ For these Bhṛgu- and Āṅgīrasa-gods the *uṣṇih* milks with every single syllable their wishes and desires. In the same way it milks for this sacrificer. He wins the *uṣṇih* among the metres and the Bhṛgu- and Āṅgīrasa-gods among the gods. To union with the Bhṛgu- and Āṅgīrasa-gods and co-existence in their world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

32. He offers during eight days. This amounts to thirty-two oblations. Of thirty-two syllables consists the *anuṣṭubh*. There are thirty-two All-gods.²⁶ They are connected with the *anuṣṭubh*. For these All-gods the *anuṣṭubh* milks with every single syllable their wishes and desires. In the same way it milks for this sacrificer. He wins the *anuṣṭubh* among the metres and the All-gods among the gods. To union with the All-gods and co-existence in their world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

33. He offers during nine days. This amounts to thirty-six oblations. Of thirty-six syllables consists the *br̥hatī*. There are thirty-six Sādhyā-gods.²⁷ They are connected with the *br̥hatī*. For these Sādhyā-gods the *br̥hatī* milks with every single syllable their wishes and desires. In the same way it milks for this sacrificer. He wins the *br̥hatī* among the metres and the Sādhyā-gods among the gods. To union with the Sādhyā-gods and co-existence in their world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

34. He offers during ten days. This amounts to forty oblations. Of forty syllables consists the *pañkti*. There are forty Marut-gods. They are connected with the *pañkti*.²⁸ For these Marut-gods the *pañkti* milks with every single syllable their wishes and desires. In the same way it milks for this sacrificer. He wins the *pañkti* among the metres and the Marut-gods among the gods. To union with the Marut-gods and co-existence in their world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

35.²⁹ He offers during eleven days. This amounts to forty-four oblations. Of forty-four syllables consists the *triṣṭubh*. There are forty-four Rudra-gods. They are connected with the *triṣṭubh*. For these Rudra-gods the *triṣṭubh* milks with every single syllable their wishes and desires. In the same way it milks for this sacrificer. He wins the *triṣṭubh* among the metres and the Rudra-gods among the gods. To union with the Rudra-gods and co-existence in their world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

36. He offers during twelve days. This amounts to forty-eight oblations. Of forty-eight syllables consists the *jagatī*. There are forty-eight Āditya-gods. They are connected with the *jagatī*. For these Āditya-gods the *jagatī* milks with every single syllable their wishes and desires. In the same way it milks for this sacrificer. He wins the *jagatī* among the metres and the Āditya-gods among the gods. To union with the Āditya-gods and co-existence in their world he ascends who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

37. Like³⁰ *brahman*, which has no master, no last resort, nothing standing above it, he rules³¹ there. This same agnihotra *brahman* once offered during twelve days.³² Having offered it during twelve days, fame, glory, (the power of) procreation,³³ immortality, that (all) it extracted. After it had offered this agnihotra during twelve days and had transferred it to Prajāpati, *brahman* went up to heaven.

This agnihotra Prajāpati offered during twelve days. Having offered it during twelve days, knowledge, understanding, deliberation, austerity, (all) that he extracted. After he had offered this agnihotra during twelve days and had transferred it to the gods and the seers Prajāpati went up to heaven.

This agnihotra the gods and the seers offered during twelve days. After they had offered it during twelve days and had transferred it to the primeval mortals they also went up to heaven.³⁴

This agnihotra *brahman* offered during twelve days. During twelve days Prajāpati, during twelve days the gods and the seers (also

offered it). Having offered it during twelve days each time they obtained their wishes and desires. How much more (will he obtain these) who offers thus (or: that)³⁵ during his whole life.

38. He should offer this agnihotra during three days with milk. That indeed is a representation of the *agniṣṭoma*. There is sacrificed with the *agniṣṭoma* by him who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

He should offer this agnihotra during three days with co-agulated milk. That indeed is a representation of the *vājaḥpeya*. There is sacrificed with the *vājaḥpeya* by him who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

He should offer this agnihotra during three days with clarified butter. That indeed is a representation of the *āsvamedha*. There is sacrificed with the *āsvamedha* by him who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

He should offer this agnihotra during three days with water. That is a representation of the *puruṣamedha*. There is sacrificed with the *puruṣamedha* by him who offers the agnihotra knowing thus.

³⁶The sacrificer himself wearing new clothes should offer the agnihotra in fires that are permanently maintained, not leaving home. Having sacrificed with soma or with a sacrificial victim during the thirteenth night he should dismiss (those fires;³⁷ i.e. he should give up the constant preservation of all the three fires) as one would dismiss (i.e. sent off) people after having supplied them with provision³⁸ (for the journey).³⁶

The primeval mortals offered³⁹ this agnihotra during twelve days. Because of it⁴⁰ for them (i.e. the mortals who have lived since that time) the cow yields milk, the ox draws, the horse is bridled,⁴¹ the mule serves⁴² (man), the elephant is harnessed⁴³ and draws.

NOTES

¹ *teṣāṃ evaitat pratyāśaṃ pratyapacayati*. This sentence contains two problems: the interpretation of *pratyapacayati* and *pratyāśaṃ*. According to A. Frenz, *Über die Verben im Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa* (thesis Marburg 1966), p. 13 *pratyāśaṃ* would mean "nach [allen vier] Himmelsrichtungen" (cf. M.-W.). In the present context, however, this signification is hardly suitable since we need an object of *pratyapacayati* or at least an accusative depending on *prati*. I assume that *pratyāśaṃ* refers to the fact that those animals which had been eaten on earth consume the eater in return in yonder world. On this conception see the story of Bhṛgu (JB. 1, 42 ff.). In the next chapter presumably in order to avoid a *pratyāśa* in yonder world a symbolical abstaining from all food is achieved. The term *pratyāśa* with this meaning would be a hapax legomenon, but *āśa-* is found in compounds (i.e. *prāta-*

rāśa-) meaning "eating" and the verb *pratyatti* (referring to eating in return) occurs ŚB. 12, 9, 1, 1 *sa yad dha vā asmim loke puruṣo 'nnam atti tad enam amuṣmim loke pratyatti* "and whatever food a man consumes in this world, that (food), in return, consumes him in yonder world" (Eggeling). On *pratyapacayati* Frenz, referring to TB. 1, 1, 2, 1 f. *atho khalu, agninaḥśatram ity apacāyanti* . . . ("Weiter nun volziehen sie die Abfindung 'agninaḥśatra' . . ."), observes: "Die Belegstellen im JB für apa-cāy zeigen alle das 'ā' als Wurzelsvokal und flektieren nur im Aktiv (. . .). Es liegt daher nahe, auch p 13, 17.22. [i.e. in the present passage] *apacāyati zu lesen. Andererseits könnte man *cayati auch von √ci ableiten, jedoch flektiert diese nach WhR in der thematischen Klasse nur im Medium. Im PW findet sich für apa-cāy = apa-ci die Bedeutung "scheuen, respektieren, Rücksicht nehmen auf". Besieht man das Substantiv apaciti f. "Vergeltung, Sühne", so findet man für p 13, 17.22 die passende Bedeutung." Frenz' interpretation of *apacayati* seems to be basically correct ("die Abfindung vollziehen"). His emendation *apacāyanti*, however, does not convince since *apacāyati* refers to showing respect to Prajāpati in the JB. contexts, which is quite different from "abfinden". Presumably *apacayati* in this passage is identical to the middle voice *apacayate*. Compare KS. 38, 13: 115. 5 *apāsyā nairṛtān pāśān mṛtyor ekaśatam caye*, translated by Caland, *Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba* III, p. 33 (ĀpSS. 16, 16, 1) "Ich verscheuche (?) von uns die Stricke der Nirṛti, die hundert und eine Todesarten". It is very doubtful whether *apacayate* means "verscheuchen"; a translation which is not supported by any etymology. As there can be no doubt that *apacaye* in this context expresses the idea of driving away and the meaning "to revenge" is out of place, it may be supposed that *apacayate* here means "to send or drive away (*apa*) by showing honour, to put off, to get rid off in an honourable way". Or perhaps *apa* should not be stressed so much and *apacayati/te* be taken as "to make a compensation (*apaciti*) for or against (*prati*)", i.e. "to buy off, redeem".

² On the identification of Agni and death see JB. 1, 12.

³ For *salokatā* and *sāyujyam* see Gonda, *World and Heaven in the Veda* (Amsterdam Acad. 1966), p. 113 ff. and p. 157.

⁴ Raghu Vira punctuates *saṃvatsaro vā idam sarvaṃ yad ihāśnāti yat pibati yasmai kasmai cana prativyādādāti | sarvaṃ tad asyāśatam bhavati* . . . The *daṇḍa* should, however, not be put after *prativyādādāti*, but before *yad aśnāti*, as the equation of year and *sarvaṃ* is quite current. Cf. ŚB. 1, 6, 1, 19; 1, 7, 2, 24; 4, 2, 2, 7; 10, 2, 5, 16; 11, 1, 2, 12 *sarvaṃ vai saṃvatsaraḥ* and ŚB. 8, 7, 1, 1 *saṃvatsara idam sarvaṃ*.

⁵ Instead of *yāvaj jivānāśakapratī bhavati* read *yāvajjivānāśakavratī bhavati*, a simple emendation, as *p* and *v* are easily confounded. The vow of fasting during the whole life (here only "symbolically" performed) should avert the *pratyāśaṃ* to which JB. 1, 26 (see n. 1) refers.

⁶ The moon usually takes in the fourth position after *agni*, *vāyu* and *āditya*; see e.g. A.O. 4, p. 23.

⁷ Cf. JUB. 3, 7, 1, 8 *śoḍaśakalam vai brahma*; 4, 11, 4, 2 *śoḍaśakalam brahma*. In ŚB. Prajāpati is often called *śoḍaśakala-*. For the significance of the number 16 see Gonda, *Change and Continuity in Indian Religion* (The Hague 1965), p. 115 ff.

⁸ The expression *idam sakṛt sarvaṃ* occurs ŚB. 9, 2, 3, 44 *yajñīyam evaitad idam sakṛt sarvaṃ karoti*, where Eggeling's translation "he thus at once makes everything here fit for sacrifice" does not take into account the position of *sakṛt* between *idam* and *sarvaṃ*. Probably *sakṛt* should be taken as an adverb with the predicate at ŚB. 7, 1, 1, 14 *sakṛd dhaivedaṃ sarvaṃ samudro nirma-*

jyāt "the ocean surely would all at once overflow all this (earth)", but following *idam* it seems to belong to *sarvam*. See also ŚB. 3, 3, 3, 1; 4 *idam sakṛt sarvaṃ paṇyam* "any and everything is vendible here" (Eggeling). In all probability *sakṛt*, which in the JB. passage cannot be taken with a predicate, denotes the completeness of the All or Whole (*sarvam*). Cf. Greek 'ἅπας beside πᾶς and see Gonda, *Reflections on the Numerals "one" and "two" in Ancient Indo-European Languages* (Utrecht 1953), p. 70 f. For *sakṛt* in connection with *sarvam* see also AgnPrāy. 4 b (Von Negelein, *Atharvaprāyaścittāni*, p. 90, n. 318) *dharmakāmā ḡnihotraṃ sakṛd eva sarvaṃ juhuyur. nātra bhakṣo 'sti*. On *śoḍaśakala-* in this connection see ŚB. 13, 2, 2, 13; ŚāṅkhB. 8, 1; 16, 4; 17, 1; 22, 6 *śoḍaśakalam vā idam sarvaṃ* and Gonda, *Change and Continuity in Indian Religion*, The Hague 1965, p. 121.

⁹ In *ripraṃ pāpaṃ karma* the meaning of *ripraṃ* is "taint". It stands in apposition to *pāpaṃ karma*. On the other hand *ripra-* occurs as an adjective (e.g. ŚB. 5, 4, 3, 24 *ripratara-*) and means "vile, bad".

¹⁰ *tata-*, p.p.p. of *tan-*, means "covered over by (instr.)", a usage not found in other Vedic texts.

¹¹ *pravṛtta-* seems to be identical with *pravarta*, a particular round ornament. Cf. ŚB. 5, 4, 3, 24. Or should we read *pravṛktas* (Oertel, *J.V.S.* 1, p. 136)?

¹² For the comparison see also JB. 1, 10.

¹³ From here to the end of JB. 1, 28 see Caland, *JB. Auswahl*, p. 13 f.

¹⁴ The black spot in the moon, the *candramasi kṛṣṇam* (ŚB. 1, 2, 5, 18; TB. 1, 1, 3, 3; AB. 4, 27, 7), is considered to be a hare. Cf. ŚB. 11, 1, 5, 3.

¹⁵ Cf. ŚB. 14, 1, 3, 4 *eṣa vai yamo ya eṣa tapaty eṣa hīdām sarvaṃ yamayaty etenedaṃ sarvaṃ yatam*. Caland, o.c., p. 13 emends *yamiti*, the reading of his mss., to *yamati*. Oertel's superior conjecture *yamayati* (JB. *Roots and Verb-forms*, p. 65 f.), confirmed by one of Raghu Vira's mss., should be adopted.

¹⁶ *eṣa mṛtyur yad yamo 'tsyann eva nāma*. Cf. VādhS. 3, 19 (A.O. 4, p. 19 f.) *sa u ha vā eṣa eva mṛtyur yad agnīḥ; sa prajāpatiṃ atsyato rūpenānvāgacchat*. See also VādhS. 4, 109 (A.O. 6, p. 232) *sa prajāpatiṃ atsyato rūpenābhipalāyata*.

¹⁷ *ūrj-*, the *loka* connected with the moon, refers to the strengthening juice of the rain which comes from the moon and enters the plants (see section 7-8, n. 3).

¹⁸ Caland's punctuation and translation of this sentence (JB. *Auswahl*, p. 13 f.) is untenable as Veda Vyasa also observed.

¹⁹ Just as the chariot of smoke was connected with Agni, the chariot of the stormcloud with Vāyu and the chariot of the rays of light with Āditya, so the golden ship of the *svadhā* is connected with the moon. The pitṛs are living at the moon according to some Indian traditions.

²⁰ The *saviṃśa* stoma is equated with the year (likewise a manifestation of Prajāpati) ŚB. 8, 4, 1, 15. Prajāpati is connected with the number twenty-one, so he is *sa-viṃśa* "having the number twenty in his own number", a "tween".

²¹ *nabhas* is "etymologically" explained as *na* (negation) and **bhas* "fear". *abhī-* is a hapax legomenon.

²² The eight Vasus, constantly homologized with the eight-syllabic *gāyatrī*, here agree in number with the *gāyatrī* stanza of twenty-four syllables. Indeed the "numbers have no specific value in themselves"; "the essential point is the formation of the number, rather than its size" (Heesterman, *The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration*, p. 34 f.).

²³ *kāmān nikāmān*. For this kind of stylistic repetition see Gonda, *Stylistic Repetition in the Veda* (Amsterdam Acad. 1959), p. 204 ff.

²⁴ Instead of associating the Bhrgvaṅgiras, whose number is not fixed, with the 28-syllabled *uṣṇih*, GB. more logically connects these two combined groups of gods with the two combined metres *uṣṇih* and *kakubh* (1, 2, 24; 1, 5, 25).

²⁵ Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 13 takes *bhrgvaṅgirasō devās ta uṣṇiham anvāyattās* .. as an instance of the "proleptic nominative", but Raghu Vira's punctuation (*daṇḍa* after *devāḥ*) is evidently correct. The initial position of the demonstrative pronoun (*ta uṣṇiham* .. *tebhya uṣṇig* ..) is quite usual. See section 22-25, n. 5.

²⁶ The *Viśve Devas* are frequently associated with the *anuṣṭubh*. See A. Weber, *Ueber die Metrik der Inder* (= *Indische Studien* 8), Berlin 1863, p. 39. This connection seems to be based on numeral symbolism (on which see Gonda, *Savayajñas*, p. 130 f. for further literature). In order to understand the present correlation one has to consider the position of the *anuṣṭubh* among the Vedic metres, which are arranged in two series: a) The *sapta chandāmsi caturuttarāṇi* of which the total number of syllables in a stanza increases by four (Weber, o.c., p. 20 f.). b) The three chief metres *gāyatrī*, *triṣṭubh* and *jagatī* supplemented with the *anuṣṭubh* and sometimes extended to five (*pañkti*) or six (*atichandas*). Weber, o.c., p. 16 f. remarks on the latter series "dass es sich hierbei nicht um ein in strikter Gleichförmigkeit ansteigendes metrisches System handelt, sondern vielmehr um eine Gruppierung, welche auf dem mystischen Grunde der grösseren oder geringeren Heiligkeit der betreffende Metra und der mit denselben in Beziehung gebrachten Gegenstände beruht". The system is, however, undoubtedly based on the increasing number of syllables. The difference with the first series is that in the first three metres only the syllables of the *pāda* are counted (8, 11, 12), whereas the total number of the syllables in the stanzas of the next metres form an increasing series: 32 (= 4 × 8); 40 (= 5 × 8); 56 (= 7 × 8). Unlike the *caturuttarāṇi* all these metres form unmixed stanzas. Now in numeral symbolism the principle of the element added to a totality is important. See Heesterman, o.c., p. 35 and Bergaigne, *La religion védique d'après les hymnes du Rig-Veda*, II (Paris 1883), p. 123 ff. This element, surpassing, summarizing and encompassing the entities of the fixed series which it closes is represented in the metrical classifications by the *virāj*, the eight metre added to the *sapta caturuttarāṇi* (Weber, o.c., p. 20 f.), by the *anuṣṭubh* which encompasses the three chief metres, by the *pañkti*, centre in cosmic equations (Heesterman, o.c., p. 36; Gonda, o.c., p. 131) and by the *atichandas* uniting in itself all metres (Weber, o.c., p. 64 f.). The number four, often one-sidedly regarded as comprising a triad and a fourth, secret element (the *turiyam padam*) sometimes has an encompassing function, as appears from TS. 4, 2, 1, 1, where the three chief metres are homologized with earth, atmosphere, heaven and the *anuṣṭubh* with the quarters (symbol of totality). Compare also the classification of GB. 1, 5, 15 in which the fourth element (*apas, candramās, viśve devāḥ, anuṣṭubh* etc.) is equated with *sarvam*. The inclusive character of the *anuṣṭubh* as fourth additional element appears from several passages, of which I mention here TS. 5, 1, 3, 5 *sarvāṇi chandāmsi paribhūḥ*; JB. 1, 285 *anuṣṭubham eva sarvāṇi chandāmsy upāsmahe*; PB. 6, 3, 14 *eṣā vā anuṣṭub sarvatrāpīḥ savanāny anvāyattā*; JB. 1, 284 *apī vā etasyai prātassavane 'pi mādhyamdine savane 'pi tṛtīyasavane 'pi vā etasyai brahmany apī kṣatre 'pi viśy apī vā etasyā asmin loke 'py antarikṣe 'py amuṣmin. sa ya evam etām anuṣṭubham sarvatrāpīṇaṃ veda sarvatra haivāsyāpi puṇyo bhavati*. Perhaps also JB. 1, 120 *tad evānuṣṭubh āntād anvāyattā* does not refer to the fact that the *anuṣṭubh* is added to the three metres, as Caland, *JB. Auswahl*, p. 28

supposes ("die Anuṣṭubh ist ihnen hinter (?) angehängt"), but to its being correlative to all of them. The usual meaning of *anvāyatta*- is "connected with, identical, associated". The gods try to reach heaven by means of the *anuṣṭubh* and not the *gāyatrī*, *triṣṭubh* or *jagati*, because it is completely (literally "to the end" *āntād*; for *āntād* cf. JB. 1, 284; for *ā* + abl. see Minard, *Trois Enigmes* I, § 156 b; here *āntād* = *āntam*) equal to all of them. Being homologized to *vāc* it includes all metres TB. 1, 7, 5, 5; JB. 1, 276. The authors of the brāhmaṇas explain this encompassing nature of the *anuṣṭubh* by the following calculations: $8 + 11 + 12 + 1$ (= *vāc*, the *nīdhana* of the *yajñā-yajñīya*; i.e. the *anuṣṭubh* itself as the extra element representing the totality, added to a sum or whole) = 32 (JB. 1, 284 f.; 2, 101 f.; PB. 10, 5, 9 f.); $8 + 1$ (the *him* sound) + $11 + 12$ = 32 (PB. 6, 3, 13). The *anuṣṭubh* is equated with the *virāj* of 33 syllables (Weber, o.c., p. 22 f.), an identification not only based on the "nahezu völlige Gleichheit der Silbenzahl" (Weber, o.c., p. 61), but also on the identity of function, both representing the totality of the metres.

Turning now to its divine correlate, the All-gods, we observe the same encompassing function. See JB. 1, 238-240 (JB. *Auswahl*, p. 92 ff.), where the Vasus, Rudras, Ādityas and finally the Viśve Devas praise Agni. The stoma is called *vaiśvadeva*- because *viśveṣāṃ haiva devānāṃ purā stoma āsa* (JB. 1, 240). So the Viśve Devas are a separate group of gods and at the same time all above mentioned gods, but not all (*sarve*) gods who were in search of food (*tam etam annaṃ jīgīvāṃsaṃ sarve devā abhisamāgacchanta*), for those who had no share in the sacrifice (i.e. those who were not mentioned in the enumeration closed by the Viśve Devas) perished with hunger. For this double aspect of the All-gods see Renou, *E.V.P.* 4, p. 6; Dumézil, *Jupiter, Mars, Quirinus* 4 (Paris 1948), p. 156; idem, *L'Héritage Indo-Européen à Rome* (Paris 1949), p. 214, where he observes that the expression *viśve devāḥ*, denoting all gods and not a separate group, "sert alors soit à désigner en bref la totalité du monde divin [see e.g. ŚB. 13, 5, 3, 1 *viśve vai sarve devās* ...; cf. also ŚāṅkhB. 4, 14; 5, 2; GB. 2, 1, 20], soit à résumer et éventuellement à compléter une énumération de catégories divines déjà faite [see above]". One may, however, doubt that in this last function the Viśve Devas always refer to all the gods and not to a separate group with preference for the final position. See Renou, o.c., p. 7; 10. Probably the Viśve Devas are: a) all gods; b) a separate group of gods in final position including all the preceding gods as the element added to a whole; c) a separate group in final position, added for the sake of completeness and for fear of omitting a god; d) an entirely separate group. Dumézil, *Héritage*, p. 214 ff. takes the Viśve Devas who are equated with the vaiśyas as a separate group of gods in contrast with all gods (see quotation above). Actually, however, the identification of the Viśve Devas with the third class (*viś*) is not primarily based on an etymological relationship, but on the fact that the third position implies the final, completing position. The third *savana* is connected with the All-gods. The third day of the *prṣṭhya śaḍaha*, related with them, is regarded as the end: *antas tṛtīyam ahaḥ* (AB. 5, 2, 11). Cf. PB. 19, 12, 8 calling the *anuṣṭubh* the *anto* ... *chandasaṃ*. The fact that it is called "the end of the metres" is not due to its being created from Prajāpati's feet (as Caland supposes). Because it was the last of the metres, it is considered to have sprung from Prajāpati's extremities, from his feet. The Viśve Devas in third position are not only the last of the series (cf. AB. 8, 6, 3, for an equation with the last of the *caturuttarāṇi* metres), but they also include and are equal to the two constantly preceding gods Agni and Indra, as appears from ŚB. 3, 9, 2, 14 ff., where Agni and Indra

together correspond to the Viśve Devas. They are placed in the centre, the well-known encompassing element, at ŚB. 8, 6, 1, 9. In the discord between the gods they are associated with Bṛhaspati in fifth and last position at TS. 6, 2, 2, 1; in fourth and last position at AB. 1, 24, 4, whereas ŚB. 3, 4, 2, 1 argues against TS. 6, 2, 2, 1 (and not against AB. 1, 24, 4 as Eggeling holds) that the Viśve Devas are not a separate fifth group, but are identical with the four parties of gods mentioned. We should not assume with Weber, *Indische Studien* 13, p. 268 that the occurrence of the Viśve Devas as fourth or fifth group in the sixth and eighth books of ŚB. is incompatible with ŚB. 3, 4, 2, 1 and a proof for the thesis that these books belong to a different stratum of ŚB. As fourth and fifth group the All-gods encompass the other gods being indeed, in a certain sense, identical with the groups of the other gods. However in the quarrel of the gods as described at ŚB. 3, 4, 2, 1 the separateness of those groups is stressed. In that context the Viśve Devas could hardly be the final, encompassing element. That is why TS. 2, 2, 11, 5; MS. 3, 7, 10: 90. 1 f.; KS. 24, 9: 100. 4 do not mention them and ŚB. 3, 4, 2, 1 even excludes them.

So we may conclude that the identification of the *anuṣṭubh* with the Viśve Devas is based on their peculiar position at the end of a series in which they may act as a separate entity and at the same time as the encompassing totality. The fact that the number of the All-gods (33) almost coincides with that of the syllables may have been of secondary influence.

²⁷ The number of the Sādhyas is unknown. They are nowhere associated with the *brhatī*. Perhaps as the celestial gods par excellence they are here homologized with the *brhatī*, the symbol of heaven.

²⁸ The *pankti*, consisting of five *pādas* and being the fifth metre in both classifications, is equated with all which is fivefold or comes fifth. The Maruts sometimes are the fifth group of gods, e.g. JB. 2, 25; 3, 152; ŚB. 14, 4, 2, 24. The fifth day of the *prṣṭhya śaḍaha* is associated with the *pankti* as well as with the Maruts ŚāṅkhB. 23, 3. They are (but not in fifth position) connected with the *pankti* ŚB. 10, 3, 2, 10 (where the Viśve Devas are related to the *anuṣṭubh*).

²⁹ The editors' *Studies in the JB.* refer (ad JB. 1, 35) to PB. 6, 7, 10. In Caland's note on PB. 6, 7, 10 (in his translation of that text) should be read 1, 85.

³⁰ Here *na* should be taken as a particle of comparison and the sacrificer as the subject since it is inconceivable that *brahman* (as the subject of the sentence) would not shine or rule somewhere. This use of *na* is not found in the brāhmaṇas according to Macdonell, *Vedic Grammar for Students*, p. 236. It is no longer understood while occurring in a verse ŚB. 1, 4, 1, 30. See Minard, *Trois Enigmes* I, § 446: "Erreur précieuse puisqu'elle atteste que *na* comparateur était sorti de l'usage au point de n'être plus compris dans un mantra. Mais témoignage qu'il est malaisé d'accorder avec les efforts faits par Lüders SBBerl. 1916 298 et 304 pour le retrouver dans les Up. (Ren. 520)". Actually, however, Lüders tried to demonstrate that the upaniṣads (i.e. ChU. 4, 3, 7) surely did not understand this *na* occurring in an old verse and that the brāhmaṇas (i.e. JUB. 3, 1, 2, 4) probably did neither (o.c., p. 304: "... dessen wahre Bedeutung vielleicht schon der Brāhmaṇakommentator nicht mehr kannte"). The use of this *na* in the prose of a brāhmaṇa which is not one of the oldest is very peculiar.

³¹ *virājati* might also mean "to shine out, be glorious".

³² *dvādaśāham*, taken with *agnihotram* as an adjective by Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 77, evidently is an adverb, as appears from the end of JB. 1, 37:

tad dvādaśāhaṃ dvādaśāhaṃ (iter. adv.) *huvā kāmān nikāmān āpuḥ. kim u ya evaṃ yāvajjivam* (adv., on a line with *dvādaśāhaṃ*) *juhuyāt*.

³³ All the mss. have *prajāpatim*, but one should read with Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 77 *prajātim*. Compare JB. 1, 56, where all the mss. read *prajāpatir* and Raghu Vira rightly conjectures *prajātir*.

³⁴ On this passing of the agnihotra from brahman to Prajāpati, to the gods and ṛṣis and ultimately to man see also VādhS. 3, 21 (A.O. 4, p. 22 f.): *tad vā etat prajāpatir evam agnihotram ajuhot* (...) *abhi suvargam lokam ajayat*; *tat prajāpatiḥ suvar yan putrebhyo devebhyah prāyacchat*; *tad devā ajuhavyas* (...) *abhi suvargam lokam ajayams*; *tad ṛṣayah suvar yantaḥ putrebhyo brāhmaṇebhyah prāyacchams* ...

³⁵ *enam* of the critical edition cannot be retained and should be emended either to *enad* (thus reads Caland's transcription of the ms. at the University Library Utrecht) or to *evam*.

³⁶ This passage occurs with some small difference ĀpSS. 5, 23, 3 as a quotation from the Śātyāyani Brāhmaṇa. See Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 18, p. 40 f. and Ghosh, *Lost Brāhmaṇas*, p. 91. ŚāṭB. mentions a period of thirteen days against JB., ĀpSS. 5, 22, 13 and other sūtras a period of twelve days. Caland, "Over en uit het JB.", o.c., p. 6 f. classes this passage among those quotations which may originally have been identical verbally, but which exhibit small differences caused by carelessness in quoting. Indeed *trayodaśarātram* of ŚāṭB. has evidently crept in under influence of *trayodaśim rātrim* which is omitted by ŚāṭB., but perfectly makes sense in JB. (whereas *trayodaśarātram* is contrary to all evidence of the sūtras).

³⁷ The object of *utsrjeta* is *agnin*, as also appears from ŚāṭB. It has to be taken from *agnisu* in the preceding sentence.

³⁸ Instead of *yathā sāvasān kṛtvā prārjayet* ŚāṭB. reads *yathā suyavasān kṛtvā prājyāt*, translated by Caland (ĀpSS. 5, 23, 3) "Es ist dies, als ob er die Zugtiere, nachdem er sie während einer Reise gut gefüttert hat, antreiben würde". For a similar translation see *Śrautakośa I, Engl. Section*, p. 62. The point of comparison is, however, that the fires which one dismisses, i.e. allows to extinguish, receive an extra-portion of food (*soma* or *paśu*) on the day of their dismissal, just as people are supplied with provisions at the moment they are sent away for a long journey. The reading of JB. seems to be preferable since the comparison between the dismissal of the fires and the dismissal of people undertaking a journey looks more suitable than the ŚāṭB. comparison. On *avasam* see Lokesh Chandra, *Gavāmayana*, p. 18 (in a note on JB. 2, 8): "*avasa* signifying 'food, provisions, viaticum' is a Samhitā word (...). It does not occur in the other Brāhmaṇas". See, however, ŚB. 2, 6, 2, 17, where *avasa-* is found and the compound *sāvasa-* occurs in the same context with the verb *arj-*: *avasena vā adhvānam yanti. tad enam sāvasam evānvavārjati* ... "(supplied) with provisions people indeed set out on a journey: hence he thereby dismisses him supplied with provisions ..." (Eggeling). For *sāvasa-* see also JB. 1, 165 (JB. *Auswahl*, p. 63). On the strength of *anvavārj-* at ŚB. 2, 6, 2, 17 one may assume that *prārjayati* also means "to dismiss". The dictionaries do not give this meaning. The tenth present class does not change the meaning of the root *arj-*. Compare JB. 3, 307 *yajñam evainad āptvā viśrjante* (...) *sa yathā nyokasam gām samyujya prārjayed evam evaitad vācam ca yajamānam ca samyujya prārjayanti* (see also Oertel, *J.V.S.* 1, p. 136 f.).

³⁹ The critical edition reads here and in the preceding chapter *juhuvām cakruḥ*, whereas Oertel, *JB. Roots and Verb-forms*, p. 113 f. reads *juhuvām cakruḥ* (*cakāra*).

⁴⁰ A remote parallel is found ŚB. 13, 1, 9, 3 ff. *tasmāt purā dhenur dogdhri jajñe* ... *tasmāt purānaḍvān voḍhā jajñe* ... *tasmāt purāśvaḥ sartā jajñe* ...

⁴¹ *ādadhānaḥ prahito* 'svo is evidently corrupt. It must form a syntactical unit since *ādadhānaḥ* can hardly be taken with the preceding noun *anaḍvān*. In order to restore the correct reading one has to consider first what is the general thought expressed in this sentence. This seems to be that the animals were domesticated as a result of the twelve-day agnihotra. The specific faculty of the horse is running fast (cf. n. 40). Here, however, the text refers to domestication (*adhikakṣyo!!*). Just as the elephant is put in (*adhi*) a girth (*kakṣyā*), so the horse is put in a bit and bridle. All the mss. except one read *ādadhānaḥ* and most of them *pratihito*. The bit of a bridle is called *ādhanam* (see M.-W., s.v.). Cf. TS. 6, 5, 9, 1 f.; KS. 28, 9: 163. 18; KapS. 44, 9; MS. 4, 7, 4: 98. 16; TB. 1, 6, 3, 9. An emendation like *ādhanapratihito* would not seem to be too bold. It easily accounts for the corruptions: *ādhanā* became separated from *pratihito* and came to be written *ādhanāḥ* and later corrected into *ādadhānaḥ*. The, then meaningless, term *pratihito* (from *prati-dhā*) was changed into *prahito* (from *pra-hi-*) "urged on, running, speeding" in order to obtain a significant attribute of the horse.

⁴² *upatiṣṭhati* "to be subservient to man, e.g. as a beast of burden".

⁴³ For *adhikakṣya-* (see n. 41), a bahuvrīhi meaning *adhi kakṣyāyām san*, compare Caland, "Über das Rituelle Sūtra des Bauddhāyana", *Abh. K.M.* 12, 1 (Leipzig 1903), p. 62 referring to BSS. 11, 6 and 12, 7, where this term likewise relates to elephants ("mit den Gurten versehen").

39-41. *Systematic treatment and interpretation of the agnihotra ritual from the beginning to the end*

In ch. 39 the ritual from the milking of the cow to the ladling out is succinctly described. The main stress falls on the formulas used. Hardly any brāhmaṇa interpretations are found in this chapter. Several formulas do not occur in the sūtras. The incidental agreements with single texts mentioned in the notes do not seem to warrant definite conclusions; the less so as the agnihotra brāhmaṇas hardly contain any formulas.

Ch. 40 mainly deals with the fourfold ladling out of the milk and its equation with four other sacrifices. For these identifications — the agnihotra is frequently homologized with other rites — see e.g. TB. 2, 3, 7, 2 ff., where the agnihotra is equal to Full- and New-Moon sacrifices, the Four-monthly sacrifices, the *paśubandha*, the soma sacrifice and the *saṃvatsara sattra*. For other homologies see A.O. 4, p. 20 (offering the milk from the four teats of the cow means performing four great sacrifices) and 6, p. 151 (substitution of the agnihotra by the soma sacrifices). Similar equations (with the same turns of phrase, see the introd. of 26-38) are found in ch. 38.

Ch. 41 connects the ritual actions after the offering with several deities and ominous powers who are appeased and propitiated. Many parallels are found in the sūtras, but this subject (the so-called *vaiśvadevam*) already appears in the oldest texts. See KS. 6, 5: 54. 11 ff.; MS. 1, 8, 5: 121. 15 ff.; TB. 2, 1, 4, 6 ff.; ŚāṅkhB. 2, 2 (ed. Sarma 2, 3); ŚB. 11, 5, 3, 1 ff.; GB. 1, 3, 12. A rather simple version is found in KS. Supposedly the very elaborate treatment of this subject in JB. (with many details in agreement with the sūtras) points to the comparative lateness of this agnihotra section in JB.

39. After having united the agnihotra cow (with her calf) he says: "Those who are united are Heaven and Earth. The Rudras collect what has been milked by the Vasus".¹ (With the formula) "Ye are the prosperity-bringing ones, danger coming from abroad (in the form of a raid) has been pushed away"² he pushes the coals away (out of the gārhapatya). Then he puts (the milk) on (these coals with the formula) "Thou art put on Vaiśvānara's (fire).³ May Agni not consume thy glow.⁴ For truth, thee". Then he illuminates (the milk by holding a burning stick or grassblade over it with the formula) "(Be) light (united) with light".⁵ Then he pours water on it (with the formula) "Fill up (or: mix) thyself with thy sap which has entered into the waters".⁶ What the waters consume of it then, that he thereby pours on it again.⁷ (With the formula) "Excluded is the

Rākṣasa race, excluded are the Adversities (*arātis*)"⁸ he thrice passes a fire sunwise round (the milk). Then he removes (the milk from the coals and puts it down on the earth with the formula) "Fix heaven, fix the atmosphere, fix the earth, fix (= establish here) progeny and cattle for me, the sacrificer".⁹ (With the formula) "Ye are the welfare-bringing ones, danger coming from abroad has been pushed back"¹⁰ he pushes back the coals (into the gārhapatya). Then having taken the dipping spoon (*sruva*) and the offering spoon (*sruc*) he purifies them by heating them over the fire (with the formula) "Burnt is the Rākṣasa race, burnt are the Adversities".¹¹ Then he rubs the offering spoon in the evening (with the formula) "Together with the gods coming in the evening" and in the morning (with) "Together with the gods coming in the morning".¹² "Thee, the golden one, made of gold, (I rub)".¹³ "Thou hast a golden handle and an immortal bowl".¹³ "Thou art the channel for conveying the oblation".¹³ It (thereby) becomes the channel for conveying the oblations. Then he says: "I shall ladle out".¹⁴ He should speak: "Yes, I (shall send) myself to heaven".¹⁵

40. The first ladle which he lifts out is a representation of the Full- and New-Moon sacrifices. There is sacrificed with the Full- and New-Moon sacrifices by him who, knowing thus, lifts out the first ladle.

The second ladle which he lifts out is a representation of the Four-monthly sacrifices. There is sacrificed with the Four-monthly sacrifices by him who knowing thus lifts out the second ladle.

The third ladle which he lifts out is a representation of the *iṣṭis* and *paśubandhas*. There is sacrificed with the *iṣṭis* and the *paśubandhas* by him who knowing thus lifts out the third ladle.

The fourth ladle which he lifts out is a representation of the *tryambaka*, the *vājaṭpeya* and the *aśvamedha* sacrifices. There is sacrificed with the *tryambaka*, the *vājaṭpeya* and the *aśvamedha* sacrifices by him who knowing thus lifts out the fourth ladle.

Having taken a kindling-stick he goes eastward (to the āhavanīya). He puts (the *samidh* and the *sruva*) upon (the grass behind the āhavanīya) silently (reciting) "The kindling-stick is indeed a man. He is kindled by food (i.e. the oblation?). Make me go to heaven by the energy of the good. Where the dear embodiment of the gods and seers is, make my agnihotra go there".¹⁶ Then he lays the *samidh* on (the āhavanīya reciting) "I make thee a bridge to heaven, a golden gangway, *svāhā*".¹⁷ Then he offers. With the first (oblation) which

he offers he reaches the gods. And with the second which he offers he reaches the seers.

41. Then he wipes off (the ladle). When he wipes off the first time, he thereby propitiates the Gandharvas and the Apsaras.¹⁸ To him the Gandharvas and Apsaras say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satisfied with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

When he wipes off the second time, he thereby propitiates the house¹⁹ and the pitṛs.²⁰ To him the house and the pitṛs say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satiated with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

When he eats twice (a small portion of what is left in the ladle) by means of his finger, when he eats the first time, thereby the *prāṇa* and the *apāna*²¹ are satisfied. To him the *prāṇa* and the *apāna* say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satiated with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

When he eats the second time, thereby the *udāna* and the *apāna* are satisfied. To him the *udāna* and the *apāna* say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satiated with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

When he eats (the remaining contents of the ladle) by means of the ladle (i.e. by drinking the ladle out), he thereby propitiates the *samāna*, the *vyāna* and the embryos.²² To him the *samāna*, the *vyāna* and the embryos say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satiated with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

When he clears the ladle (i.e. when he licks it out) he thereby propitiates the divine hosts.²³ To him the divine hosts say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satiated with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

When he pours out the cleansing-water of the ladle he thereby propitiates the birds.²⁴ To him the birds say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satiated with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

The waters which he tosses upwards towards the north out of the ladle after he has washed it, thereby he propitiates the seers.²⁵ To him the seers say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satiated with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

When he pours out the cleansing-water of the cauldron, he thereby propitiates the hosts of serpents.²⁶ To him the hosts of serpents say: "Thy faith must not disappear. Become satiated with all one may wish, reach the heavenly world".

When he (the sacrificer) sits down to the south of the fires after he has circumambulated westward or eastward,²⁷ then he becomes Prajāpati and sits down (reciting the yajus:) "I am happiness (*kam*), happiness is mine".²⁸

NOTES

¹ The formulas *upasyṣṭe dyāvāprithivī* and *rudrā upagṛhṇanti vasūnām dugdham* have no parallels. They can hardly be taken with *ity āṅārān nirūhati*. This implies that here *iti* (in *ity āha*) as an exception precedes the quotation. Another solution to the problem would be taking *upasyjāgnihotrim* (emendation for *upasyjyāgnihotrim*) with the following *ity āha* and interpreting *upasyṣṭe* . . etc. as a brāhmaṇa digression. There is, however, no parallel for *upasyjāgnihotrim* as a formula and moreover *rudrā upagṛhṇanti* . . etc. looks like a verse rather than a brāhmaṇa digression.

² *bhūtākṛta stha nirūḍham janyam bhayam*. Cf. BhārSS. 6, 10, 4; ĀpSS. 6, 5, 6; HirSS. 3, 7, 26 *bhūtākṛta(h) sthāpoḍham janyam bhayam*; VaiSS. 2, 2; 3, 6 *bhūtākṛtaḥ stha*. Mostly *bhūtākṛt-* is interpreted as "creative": "Die Schöpferischen seid ihr" (Caland, ĀpSS. 6, 5, 6); "Vous êtes les créatrices" (Dumont, *L'Agnihotra*, p. 50); "You are the creators of beings" (Kashikar, transl. BhārSS.). At the pushing back of the coals ĀpSS. 6, 6, 10 and BhārSS. 6, 10, 12 have *subbhūtākṛtaḥ* . . "Die richtig Schöpferischen . ." (Caland); "les bonnes créatrices . ." (Dumont, o.c., p. 52); "the good creators of all beings" (Kashikar). Cf., however ŚSS. 2, 8, 8 *subbhūtākṛtaḥ subbhūtam naḥ kṛmā* (recited when the coals are pushed out of the fire) "Bienfaisantes, faites nous du bien" (Dumont, o.c., p. 188); "Ye welfare-bringing ones, bring us welfare" (Caland, transl. ŚSS.). See also ŚSS. 2, 8, 15 *subbhūtāya vaḥ* (recited when the coals are pushed back) "Pour la prospérité, vous!" (Dumont, o.c., p. 189); "For welfare thou" (Caland, transl. ŚSS.). In the context "welfare" (*subbhūtam*) as a result of pushing away or back the *janyam bhayam* is quite suitable. Even *bhūtam*, however, may have this meaning. So *bhūtākṛt-* does not (or at least not exclusively) refer to the creation of beings. That the welfare may consist of the fertility of the crops appears from HirSS., which leaves us to choose between *nirūḍham janyam bhayam saha tena yaṁ dviṣmaḥ subbhūtāya śrayadhvam* (3, 7, 25) and *bhūtākṛtaḥ sthāpoḍham janyam bhayam saha tena yaṁ dviṣma* (3, 7, 26) and between *pratyūḍham janyam bhayam saha tena yaṁ dviṣmaḥ subbhūtam akarta* and *bhūtākṛtaḥ sthāpyeti sasyam yajamānasya* (3, 7, 38), not to be rendered with Dumont, o.c., p. 96 by "(...) Il entre (Agni entre?) dans la moisson du sacrificant (?)", but by "(...) Crops fall to the share of the sacrificer". ĀsvSS. 2, 2, 15 *suhutākṛtaḥ stha suhutam kariṣyatha* (2, 3, 9 . . . *akārṣṭa*), probably a secondary version, cannot originate in *su-bhūtākṛtaḥ*, but presupposes *subbhūta-kṛtaḥ*. The formula *nirūḍham janyam bhayam*, occurring in this form only in JB. and HirSS. 3, 7, 25 in the agnihotra ritual, is also used by Āp., Hir. and Bhār. for the Full and New-Moon sacrifices.

³ *vaiśvānarasyādhiśritam asi*. No parallels. For the ellipse with a genitive see Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 9; for the ellipse of *agnau* with *adhiśri-* see Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, § 19 a.

⁴ *agnis te tejo mā pratidhākṣit*. BSS. 3, 5, 4 and VaiSS. 2, 3 (*dhākṣid*) apply this formula at the illuminating. Cf. ĀsvSS. 2, 3, 3 f. *avajvalayet* (..) *agnis te tejo mā hārṣir* (read *hārṣid*) *iti*. JB. uses this verse for putting the pot

of milk on the coals. Compare *agnis te tejo mā vinait*, sometimes recited in the Full- and New-Moon ritual when the butter oblation is put on the fire.

⁵ *saṃ jyotiṣā jyotiḥ* (VS. 2, 9; TS. 1, 1, 12, 1) is nowhere used in this connection.

⁶ *yas te apsu rasaḥ praviṣṭas tena saṃprcyaśva*. No parallels. Bloomfield's *Concordance* incorrectly reads *apsarasaḥ*.

⁷ I.e. he fills up with water that quantity of the milk which has boiled away.

⁸ *antaritam rakṣo 'ntaritā arātayaḥ* (TS. 1, 1, 8, 1; VSK. 1, 8, 3) should obviously be taken with *trīḥ paryagni karoti* and the daṇḍa be put before *antaritam* instead of before *trīḥ*. This formula is found in seven YV. sūtras and ĀśvSS. 2, 3, 7. It occurs also in the ritual of the Full- and New-Moon sacrifices.

⁹ The formulas *divaṃ dṛmha*, *antarikṣam dṛmha* and *prithivīm dṛmha* are frequently found in other texts, but not in this connection. Cf., however, ĀśvSS. 2, 3, 7, where the kettle is taken from the fire in three stages with *dive tvā*, *antarikṣāya tvā* and *prithivīya tvā*. For *prajām paśūn juhvato me dṛmha* see ĀpSS. 6, 6, 10; VaiSS. 2, 3 *iha prajām paśūn dṛmha*. Cf. also BhārSS. 6, 10, 10; ĀpSS. 6, 6, 8 *ihorjām dṛmha*; HirSS. 3, 7, 36 *ihorjām yaccha*; 3, 7, 37 *prajām me yaccha*.

¹⁰ *bhūtakṛta stha pratyūḍham janyam bhayam*. See n. 2.

¹¹ *pratyūṣṭam rakṣaḥ pratyūṣṭā arātayaḥ*. This formula (VS. 1, 7, 29; TS. 1, 1, 2, 1) occurs in most sūtras. It similarly accompanies the heating of the utensils over the āhavanīya in the ritual of the Full- and New-Moon sacrifices.

¹² *sajūr devebhyas sāyamāvabhyaḥ/prātaryāvabhyaḥ*. Cf. ŚSS. 2, 8, 21. The Taittiriya sūtras, TB. 2, 1, 5, 10 and VārSS. 1, 5, 2, 27 read *sajūr devais sāyamāvabhīḥ/prātaryāvabhīḥ*. All the parallels prescribe this formula for the touching of the *sthāli* and the *agnihotrahanāni* after the milk has been ladled out, whereas JB. is alone in connecting it with the rubbing of the *sruc* before the ladling out.

¹³ *suvarṇam tvām suvarṇamayīm. hiranyayaṣṭir asy amṛtapalāśā sroto yajñānām*. HirSS. 3, 7, 41 reads *suparnām tvā suparnamayīm*. ĀpSS. 6, 7, 1 does not have the first formula, whereas VaiSS. 2, 3 only quotes the *pratīka suparnām tvā*. The sūtras agree with JB. in the application of the formula (before ladling out).

¹⁴ *unneṣyāmi* is preceded by *om* in most sūtras.

¹⁵ *om mām aham svargaṃ lokam abhi*. No parallels.

¹⁶ *puruṣa it samit. tam annam indāhe annasya mā tejasā svargaṃ lokam gamaya. yatra devānām ṛṣiṇām priyaṃ dhāma tatra ma idam agnihotraṃ gamaya iti. tuṣṇīm upasādayati*. There are no parallels for the formulas *annasya mā* . . . and *yatra devānām* . . . For the latter compare, however, ĀpSS. 6, 8, 11 *saptarṣiṇām yatra lokas tatremam yajñam yajamānam ca dhehy* (. . .) *ity apareṇāhavanīyam darbheṣu sādāyati*. No sūtra prescribes a silent putting down of the milk; some do not mention a formula. The agreement with ĀpSS. 6, 8, 11, however, cannot but make us connect at least *yatra devānām* . . . with *tuṣṇīm upasādayati*. Probably *annasya mā* . . . should be taken together with *yatra devānām* . . . and both formulas are used in addressing the *samidh* which is put down together with the milk. The eleven syllables *puruṣa it samit tam annam indāhe* may belong to the silent recitation (otherwise the critical edition). The *samidh* is a man who is able to make the agnihotra go to heaven.

¹⁷ *svargasya tvā lokasya saṃkramaṇam hiraṇmayam vaṃśam dadhāmi svāhā*. Cf. ĀpSS. 6, 9, 4; HirSS. 3, 7, 61 *hiranyayam tvā vaṃśam svargasya lo-*

kasya saṃkramaṇam dadhāmi. Āpastamba explicitly states that this formula should be used in case a second *samidh* is put on the fire, whereas here only one is mentioned. The *vaṃśa* here is not an ordinary crossbeam (Caland, ĀpSS. 6, 9, 4 "Querbalke"), it is a special plank or beam used for passing over gaps. Cf. ŚāṅkhB. 11, 4; GB. 2, 3, 11 *tad yathā matyena vā vaṃśena vā gartam saṃkramed* . . . Probably a *vaṃśanartin* (TB. 3, 4, 17, 1) is some sort of rope-dancer who performs acrobatic stunts while walking over a beam connecting two points high in the air (*antarikṣāya vaṃśanartinam*).

¹⁸ No parallels.

¹⁹ Oertel, *JB. Roots and Verb-forms*, p. 61 adopts the reading *grhāṃś ca*, whereas Raghu Vira reads *grahāṃś ca* with most mss. Vedic *graha-* "draught, spoonful" is not appropriate here and it is doubtful if the meaning "planet" already occurs in the brāhmaṇas (Eggeling, *S.B.E.* 26, p. 432, n. 2). Even if *grahāḥ* could denote a certain class of demons in these texts, the association with the *pitṛs* would be odd. So *grhāṃś ca* (and in the next sentence *grhāś ca*) should be read. For the plural of *grha-* standing for the singular see Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 578 a; II, § 156 a. The house is propitiated BhārSS. 6, 14, 3; ĀpSS. 6, 12, 4; HirSS. 3, 7, 102; VaiSS. 2, 6, where the formula *grhebhyaś tvā grhān jinva* (Hir. *prīṇīhi*) is recited when water is poured into the hands of the sacrificer's wife.

²⁰ Most parallels connect this second wiping off with the *pitṛs*. The verb *upamrj-* denotes the cleansing of the ladle. In other texts *nimrj-* is sometimes found. This refers to the wiping of the finger on the earth or on the grasses. In the second wiping off the hand is placed on the earth and the smearings are removed to the south according to the sūtras (see also e.g. ŚāṅkhB. 2, 2), i.e. the region of the *pitṛs*.

²¹ Cf. GB. 1, 3, 12 *yat prathamam prāṣiṣam prāṇāms tenāpraiṣam*; VaitS. 7, 21 f. *sruḥṣeṣam prāśnāti prāṇān prīṇāmi*.

²² Cf. ĀpSS. 6, 11, 5; HirSS. 3, 7, 93 f. *garbhebhyaś tvā garbhān prīṇīhi*; VārSS. 1, 5, 2, 45 *garbhān prīṇāti garbhebhyaḥ svāheti*. BhārSS. 6, 13, 6 applies the formula *garbhebhyaś tvā garbhān jinva* at the second eating with the finger (cf. ŚāṅkhB. 2, 2 *yad dviḥ pradeṣīnyā prāśnāti garbhān pūrveṇa prīṇāti*). See further VaitS. 7, 21 f. *sruḥṣeṣam prāśnāti* . . . *garbhān* (sc. *prīṇāmi*) *iti dvitīyam*; GB. 1, 3, 12 *yad dvitīyam* (sc. *prāṣiṣam*) *garbhāms tena* (sc. *apraiṣam*); TB. 2, 1, 4, 7 *yat prāśnāti tad garbhānām*.

²³ The *devajanāḥ*, who are sometimes hosts of demons or snakes (see Gonda, *Savayajñas*, p. 330), here perhaps are equivalent to the *Viśve Devas* (cf. Gonda, o.c., p. 308 quoting Renou, *E.V.P.* 8, p. 103: "les devajana- . . . semblent résumer Āditya's et Rudra's ou équivaloir à Viśve Devāḥ"). The *Viśve Devas*, often placed in final position in enumerations and classifications, sometimes denote the totality of what has been enumerated, but they may also refer to that indefinite group of gods which is included for the sake of completeness or for fear of omitting a god. See in this connection GB. 1, 3, 12 *yad antataḥ sarvam eva prāṣiṣam viśvān devāms tenāpraiṣam*; VaitS. 7, 21 f. *viśvān devān* (sc. *prīṇāmi*) *ity antataḥ sarvam* (sc. *prāśnāti*). Perhaps the *devajanāḥ* refer to that same group of gods, this "rest of the gods", these "other gods". It is striking that MŚS. 1, 6, 1, 47 has in the same context as here *itarajanebhyaḥ svāheti nirledhi*. The *itarajanāḥ* seem to be spirits of darkness and the term may be euphemistic (Gonda, *Savayajñas*, p. 331), but it is remarkable that here this group is associated with the licking out of the remainder of the milk. See also VādhS. 4, 8 (*A.O.* 6, p. 105 f.) referring to *anyajanāḥ* (comparable to the *itarajanāḥ*) who receive the remains of the sacrificial victim ("Da fanden sie sie ab mit dem Inhalt des Magens und der

Gedärme und mit dem Blute", transl. Caland). Apparently these groups of *janāḥ* also have some demoniac aspects. See also ŚāṅkhB. 2, 2 (dealing with the licking out and removing of the residue) *yat srucam nirleḍhi sarpaḍevajanāms tena prīṇāti yat srucam mārjayate rakṣodevajanāms tena prīṇāti*. Keith may be right in taking here *sarpaḍevajanāḥ* and *rakṣodevajanāḥ* as appositive and not as dvandva compounds, but in JB. at least *sarpaḍajanāḥ* and *devajanāḥ* definitely form two different categories. Eggeling translates ŚB. 11, 5, 3, 7 *sarpaḍevajanāḥ* by "snake-deities", but compare the compound *sarpetarajanāḥ* (GB. 1, 3, 12) presumably to be analysed as *sarpa-* and *itarajanāḥ*. Caland's "die anderen Wesen als die Schlangen" (ĀpŚS. 6, 12, 4) is not convincing. That these *devajanāḥ* and *itarajanāḥ* who receive the *ucchiṣṭa* are not primarily demons ("Abfindung"!), but by receiving the remains make the sacrifice complete appears from ĀsvŚS. 2, 4, 13, where in a context without demons the *itarajanāḥ* obtain the last water libation after the seasons (the totality of time), the quarters (the totality of space) and the seven seers.

It should be observed that this licking out of the ladle is not found in the Samhitās, TB., Baudh. and Bhār., but occurs in ŚāṅkhB., ŚŚS., MŚS., KŚS., ĀpŚS. and HirŚS. So it may represent a later development. The older sources are simpler.

²⁴ No parallels. For a different propitiation of the birds (which are ominous just as the ants which are likewise propitiated according to some texts) see ŚāṅkhB. 2, 2 *yad dviḥ pradeśinyā prāśnāti . . vayāmsy uttareṇa* (sc. *prīṇāti*).

²⁵ Most sūtras mention this propitiation of the seven seers in this connection (with some variations). See also TB. 2, 1, 4, 8.

²⁶ Cf. VārŚS. 1, 5, 2, 50 *antarvedī prakṣalanam ninayati sarpaḍevajananebhyah svāheti*. Some other texts honour the snakes by pouring water out of the *sruc* (and not out of the *sthālī*).

²⁷ Cf. KŚS. 4, 13, 12 *apradakṣinam āhavanīyam parītya* (in the evening); 4, 15, 2 *pradakṣinam gārhapatyam parītya* (at dawn). The sacrificer performs this action at the beginning of the agnihotra ritual.

²⁸ See JŚS. 22 (ed. D. Gaastra, thesis Utrecht 1906 = JŚS. 23: 28, 12 ff. ed. Premnidhi Shastri, *Jaiminīya-Srauta-sūtra-vṛtti of Bhāvatrāta*, Śatapitaka series 40, New Delhi 1966) *sadāgnihotre goṣūktāśvasūkte geye* (ed. Gaastra: *gayet*). *sāyam goṣūktam prātar āśvasūktam iti. pūrvasyām āhutaḥ hutāyām. kam aham asmi kam mamety etad uktvā vā*. JB. proves that the sacrificer sings the sāmans either after he has offered the first oblation (in case he performs the agnihotra himself) or after he has taken his seat south of the āhavanīya and has recited the formula *kam aham asmi kam mama* (in case an officiant performs the sacrifice for him). So the interpretation of *Srautakośa*, English Section 1, p. 144, which implies that the formula *kam aham . .* should be recited after the first oblation has been offered, is not correct. Miss Gaastra's supposition o.c., p. 33, n. 14 is confirmed. Here *kam* meaning "auspiciousness, welfare (?)" is connected with *ka* "Prajāpati".

42-44. The story of Bhṛgu

This section was edited and translated by A. C. Burnell under the title *A Legend from the Talavakāra or Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa of the Sāma-veda*, Mangalore 1878. It was reprinted in *Atti del IV Congresso Intern. d. Orientalisti*, II (Florence 1881), p. 97 ff. and (with some omissions) in the *Indian Antiquary* 13 (1884), p. 16 ff. After this first published communication from the brāhmaṇa Oertel's edition and translation *J.A.O.S.* 15 (1892), p. 233 ff. was a considerable improvement. The parallel passage ŚB. 11, 6, 1, 1 ff. was discussed (and translated) by Weber, *Z.D.M.G.* 9 (1855), p. 237 ff. [= *Indische Streifen* I (Berlin 1868), p. 24 ff.]. Eggeling's translation *S.B.E.* 44 (Oxford 1900), p. 108 ff. ignores the parallel from JB. Without adding much to its interpretation L. Scherman, *Materialien zur Geschichte der Indischen Visionslitteratur* (Leipzig 1892), p. 5-8 refers to this passage. Translations of one of the two versions are further found in S. Lévi, *La doctrine du sacrifice dans les brāhmaṇas* (Paris 1966²; 1898¹), p. 100 ff.; Geldner, *Vedismus und Brahmanismus* (Tübingen 1928²), p. 78 ff.; H. Lommel, *Altbrahmanische Legenden* (Stuttgart 1964), p. 36 ff. (with note on p. 73 f.) and J. Varenne, *Mythes et légendes extraits des Brāhmaṇa* (Paris 1967), p. 135 ff. For an ample discussion of the meaning of this passage (in both versions) with many ethnological parallels see Lommel, *Paideuma* 4 (1950), p. 93 ff. (see also o.c. 5, p. 201 ff.).

The contents of this story are that Bhṛgu being too proud of his theoretical knowledge is taught a lesson by his father Varuṇa, who makes him see some horrible visions in yonder world. People cut other people into pieces, eat other people etc. as they have been cut or eaten (as trees or plants) by human beings on earth. Performing the agnihotra with the correct knowledge of its implications wards off this cruel fate. So Bhṛgu concludes his study and establishes his fires in order to sacrifice with the agnihotra.

According to Weber this story represents "die priesterliche Aneignung eines volksthümlichen Stoffes (. . .) Dass die Schilderung dieser Vergeltung nun wirklich eine rein volksthümliche, eine dem Munde des Volkes entlehnte sei, ergibt sich hier sogar noch aus sprachlichen Gründen" (o.c., p. 241). Indeed this episode may contain "reflections of the popular belief of the time as to the punishments awaiting the guilty in a future existence" (Eggeling, o.c., p. 108, n. 3 summarizing Weber's views). The linguistic arguments (i.e. *ti* instead of *iti*; *vibhajamānān* used as a passive) are, however, doubtful and moreover cannot be applied in the version of JB. (which on the basis of that criterion should be a younger version). See e.g. Minard's remarks (*Trois Énigmes* II, § 760) on the particle *ed*: "... son allure solennelle (. . .; fautif Egg. II xxix 'a popular expression') qui s'accorde bien avec la couleur légendaire du livre XI, où il abonde (. . ., Bhṛgu aux Enfers)". One should look at the contents rather than at the wording (which may be important for the comparative chronology of the two versions).

Weber, o.c., p. 242 observes that Varuṇa's important position in this legend proves it to be "eine sehr alterthümliche". It has been connected with Parsism (see Scherman, o.c., p. 8, n. 3). Lommel, *Paideuma* 4, p. 96 assumes a reference to the theory of rebirth in this description of yonder world, crowded with animals, trees, plants etc. in human shape: "Die in unserer Legende gebotene Anschauung von der jenseitigen Wiedergeburt der Lebewesen in verschiedenen Gestalten kann gar nicht isoliert für sich bestehen ohne die Anschauung von einer Wiedergeburt im Diesseits". I doubt, however, if one can assume that because of this rebirth in heaven or hell a parallel rebirth on earth was necessary. The description of yonder world is purely symbolical. Nobody is reborn on earth as water. Faith, Wrath etc. are just personifications in this story. It may be true that some fundamental conceptions "in die theologische Belehrung eingebaut sind" (o.c., p. 98), but as far as I am able to see one can only infer from this passage and the Indian parallels on "being eaten in return" that "animated" beings such as animals, plants etc. cannot be deprived of their "life" without consequences. The injuries inflicted on them are "revenged" in yonder world where all is the opposite of the situation in this world. Lommel, o.c., p. 101 ff. adduces interesting parallels from other cultures which prove that the motif of the reversal in the world of the dead (right is left etc.; even *agens* and *patiens* are reversed) is current in every folklore. This should warn us not to assume on weak grounds a typical Indian rebirth doctrine in this passage, which does not represent "eine von der andern Seite her gesehene Wiedergeburtstheorie" (o.c., p. 97), but a description of life from the point of view of a completely reversed position in yonder world.

On being eaten in return, one of the motifs in this episode, see n. 16. One should take special note of ŚB. 12, 9, 1, 1, where it is stated that food eats the eater in yonder world, i.e. the reversal is central, not the fact that the food consists of animals or plants which are reborn human beings. The automatism of this reversal in the world of the dead and its all-inclusiveness imply that being eaten in return and the other atrocities of this passage do not represent a moral retribution — Weber gave his paper the title "Eine Legende des Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa über die strafende Vergeltung nach dem Tode" — as Lommel, o.c., p. 99 (see also *Paideuma* 5, p. 200 ff.) rightly observes. The fact that Bhṛgu asks if there are any *prāyaścittis* (ŚB.) or *niṣkṛtis* (JB.) for averting these evils, may be a indication that this passage does not deal with moral transgressions (Lommel, *Paideuma* 4, p. 99 f.). This section does not advocate abstention from eating meat. In so far as the Vedic Indians do not repent of it, killing animals is not to be considered a sin (in our sense of the word). In their eyes the only evil is the result of the deed with relation to themselves. Since, however, all sorts of evil (produced by mistakes as well as by moral faults and sins) can be averted by means of a *prāyaścitti* (e.g. by performing the agnihotra knowing its implications), one may ask if Lommel's criticism (*Paideuma* 5, p. 202) of Keith, who speaks of "a passage on moral retribution" (*Rigveda Brahmanas*, p. 409, n. XI 3^d), is fair in every respect. For Vedic Indians sin may also include that evil

which is done inadvertently or which cannot be avoided in daily life. The morality of popular belief and the ritualists on the one side and of European "Moraltheologen" on the other side are often not in agreement.

Another point which has engaged the attention of scholars is the relation between the two versions. Burnell, who regards the version of ŚB. as "decidedly of a later time", advances no conclusive arguments for his view. Some vague remarks on the style of the two versions are not sufficient. Most of the authors mentioned in this introduction do not express an opinion on this subject. Caland, "Over en uit het JB.", o.c., p. 28 is under the impression that the JB. version has a better composition and is more original because the visit from the earth to yonder world would be more suitable for seeing the atrocities than the visit to the quarters of the universe (in ŚB.). On this doubtful point see n. 2. Lévi, o.c., p. 100 f., n. 3 mentions all the differences and concludes: "Les deux recensions sont donc bien indépendantes". That the two recensions in spite of many points of difference have much in common may appear from the following outline:

	scene	explanation	expiation
ŚB. (1)	men dismembering men hewing off (<i>saṃvraścam</i>) limbs	trees	<i>samidh</i>
JB. (1)	man cutting (<i>saṃvṛścyā</i>) man into pieces and devouring him	trees	<i>samidh</i>
ŚB. (2)	men dismembering men cutting up limbs	cattle	milk
JB. (2)	man devouring crying man	cattle	first oblation <i>vācā</i>
ŚB. (3)	silent men devouring silent men	herbs	illumination with burning straw
JB. (3)	man devouring silent man	rice and barley	second oblation <i>manasā</i>
ŚB. (4)	crying men devouring crying men	waters	water poured to the milk
JB. (4)	two women	faith and non-faith	eating twice with finger
ŚB. (5a)	two women	faith and non-faith	two oblations
JB. (5a)	black naked man	wrath	eating with spoon
ŚB. (5b)	black man	wrath	pouring out water

Conclusions:

- Five topics of the scenes are identical (though differently worked out). Only ŚB. (2) has no parallel.
- The parallelism of the scenes can be restored by replacing ŚB. (2) by ŚB. (4).

- c) Both texts have five explanations in common (if one puts "herbs" on a line with "rice and barley"). Only ŚB. (4) "waters", which does not look very acceptable, has no parallel.
- d) Leaving out this explanation "waters" and connecting its corresponding scene (4) on its right place (2) with the correct second explanation "cattle" one obtains a complete parallel.
- e) In the expiations, which have only *samidh* in common, ŚB. has used for the first four scenes (which form a unity and refer to the reversed situation in yonder world) the ingredients of the agnihotra ritual. The explanation ŚB. (4) "waters" may have been brought about by the expiation "water poured to the milk".

All these facts need not imply that ŚB. has borrowed the Bhṛgu passage from JB. It is true that especially after the first four scenes the ŚB. passage looks like an abridged version (*śraddhā*, *āśraddhā* and *krodha-* are hardly understandable in the context), but the composition of the story seems to be too independent from JB. to be a direct borrowing. Some points, some topics and some expressions are identical. A common source seems likely. The JB. version with its elaborate description of Varuṇa's world may be younger than its ŚB. parallel. The literal correspondence of *sa ha tatāma* etc. (see n. 3) with JB. 2, r60 and the fact that the theme of the father showing his own world to his son is also found at 2, r60 may be an indication that the Bhṛgu passage was adapted by JB. in its (probably) younger agnihotra section.

Finally it is to be observed that JB. very aptly builds in this Bhṛgu story in the context of this agnihotra section. It follows the propitiation of all sorts of powers by means of the agnihotra.

42. Bhṛgu, the son of Varuṇa,¹ was devoted to learning. He deemed himself superior to his father, to the gods and to the other brahmins who were devoted to learning.² Varuṇa considered: "My son knows nothing at all. Come, let me make him have a clear insight". He took his lifebreaths away. He fainted.³ Having fainted he passed from this world. He arrived in yonder world.⁴ A man cut an (other) man into pieces and then⁵ devoured him. He said: "Ah! has this (really) happened? What is (the meaning of) this?"⁶ They⁷ said to him: "Ask your father Varuṇa. He will explain it to you".

He arrived (there) a second time.⁸ A man devoured an (other) man who was crying out. He said: "Ah! has this (really) happened? What is (the meaning of) this?" They said to him: "Ask your father Varuṇa. He will explain it to you".

He arrived (there) a third time. A man devoured an (other) man who was inaudibly uttering sounds.⁹ He said: "Ah! has this (really) happened? What is (the meaning of) this?" They said to him: "Ask your father Varuṇa. He will explain it to you".

He arrived (there) a fourth time. Two women guarded a large property. He said: "Ah! has this (really) happened? What is (the meaning of) this?" They said to him: "Ask your father Varuṇa. He will explain it to you".

He arrived (there) a fifth time. (Of) two streams flowing side by side, one filled with blood and the other with ghee,¹⁰ a black naked man with a club guarded the stream filled with blood, and the stream filled with ghee, out of that golden men drew up¹¹ all things one may desire with golden cups. He said: "Ah! has this (really) happened? What is (the meaning of) this?" They said to him: "Ask your father Varuṇa. He will explain it to you".

He arrived (there) a sixth time. Five rivers with blue and white lotuses, flowing with honey as water,¹² in these there was dancing and singing, the sound of lutes, crowds of Apsaras, a fragrant smell and a great noise. He said: "Ah! has this (really) happened? What is (the meaning of) this?" They said: "Ask your father Varuṇa. He will explain it to you".

43. He returned from there. He came to Varuṇa. He (Varuṇa) said to him: "Did you arrive (there),¹³ my son?" "I have arrived (there), father". "You have seen (it), my son?" "I have seen (it), father". "What, my son?"¹⁴ "A man cut an (other) man into pieces and then devoured him". "Yes", he said; "those who in this world offer¹⁵ the agnihotra without knowing thus and cut trees and lay them on the fire, those the trees, having taken human form, eat in their turn¹⁶ in yonder world". "What is the expiation for this?" "That he lays here (i.e. in the agnihotra ritual) a log of wood on the fire, that is its expiation. By that (expiation) it is avoided".

"What (did you see) the second time?"¹⁷ "A man devoured an (other) man who was crying out". "Yes", he said; "those who in this world offer the agnihotra without knowing thus and cook for themselves animals which cry out, those the animals, having taken human form, eat in their turn in yonder world". "What is the expiation for this?" "That he offers here the first oblation with speech (i.e. reciting the formula aloud), that is its expiation. By that (expiation) it is avoided".

"What the third time?" "A man devoured an (other) man who was inaudibly uttering sounds".¹⁸ "Yes", he said; "those who in this world offer the agnihotra without knowing thus and cook themselves rice and barley, which inaudibly utter sounds, those rice and barley, having taken human form, eat in their turn in yonder world". "What

is the expiation for this?" "That he offers here the second oblation (reciting the formula) in thought, that is its expiation. By that (expiation) it is avoided".

"What the fourth time?" "Two women guarded¹⁹ a large property". "Yes", he said; "they were Faith and Non-Faith. If²⁰ any in this world offer the agnihotra without knowing thus and sacrifice without faith, then it (i.e. that sacrifice) goes to Non-Faith; if (they sacrifice) with faith, it (goes) to Faith". "What is the expiation for this?" "That he eats here twice²¹ with his finger, that is its expiation. By that (expiation) it is avoided".

44. "What the fifth time?" "(Of) two streams flowing side by side, one filled with blood and the other with ghee, a black naked man with a club guarded²² the stream filled with blood, and the stream filled with ghee, out of that (stream) golden men drew up all things one may desire with golden cups". "Yes", he said; "if²³ any in this world offer the agnihotra without knowing thus and shed (literally: press out) the blood of a brahmin, then it (i.e. that blood) becomes that stream filled with blood; and the black naked man²⁴ with a club who guarded it, he is Wrath. That (blood) indeed is his food". "What is the expiation for this?" "That he eats here with the ladle (i.e. drinks the milk out of the ladle), that is its expiation. By that (expiation) it is avoided. And the water that he tosses upwards to the north after having washed the spoon, that is the stream filled with ghee.²⁵ Out of that (stream) golden²⁶ men draw up all things one may desire with golden cups".

"What the sixth time?" "Five rivers with blue and white lotuses, flowing with honey as water, in these there was dancing and singing, the sound of lutes, crowds of Apsaras, a fragrant smell and a great noise". "Yes", he said; "these, forsooth, were my worlds". "By what are they to be won?" "By fivefoldly taking²⁷ this (milk out of the cauldron) and lifting²⁷ (it) out (into the *sruc*)". He (Bhṛgu) said: "There is indeed nowhere outside the agnihotra an opportunity for the conquest of a world (in heaven). (So) today (will be) my fast-day preceding the setting up of the sacred fires".²⁸ Thus they arranged it for him. He who knowing thus offers the agnihotra, him do not eat in their turn the trees having taken human form in yonder world, nor the animals, nor rice and barley, nor do his meritorious works and his sacrifices²⁹ go to Faith and Non-Faith. He wards off the stream filled with blood. He obtains the stream filled with ghee.

NOTES

¹ For Varuṇa's fatherhood see AB. 3, 34, 1. Cf., however, also MS. 4, 3, 9: 49. 4 ff.; PB. 18, 9, 1; JB. 2, 201. Bhṛgu asks his father TU. 3, 1 to teach him brahman.

² *anyān brāhmaṇān* may imply that Bhṛgu himself is to be considered a brahmin, unless *anya-* means "... the gods and the others, to wit the brahmins". At any rate in the JB. version Bhṛgu is a mortal, who is sent by his father Varuṇa (the god?) from earth to the *paraloka-*, whereas ŚB. seems to place the conversation between father and son and Bhṛgu's visions in one and the same celestial (?) level. After his return from the (five) quarters of the universe Varuṇa asks his son why he does not study his lesson (ŚB. 11, 6, 1, 7). This would seem to indicate that Bhṛgu is an ordinary brahmacārin, but the human conditions may have been projected in a divine environment as is often the case in the brāhmaṇas. At first sight the instruction of Bhṛgu by Varuṇa at TU. 3, 1 seems to be imparted on earth, but the passage concludes with the remark that the insight that brahman is bliss represents the knowledge of Varuṇa's son Bhṛgu which has its foundation in heaven: *saiśa bhārgavi vāruṇi vidyā parama vyoman pratiṣṭhitā*. If, indeed, Bhṛgu has to be situated in heaven, this may explain the otherwise unexplicable visits to the quarters of the universe in ŚB. If Varuṇa is in heaven when he sends his son to the quarters of the universe, then Caland's arguments ("Over en uit het JB.", p. 28) in favour of the originality of JB. (see the introd. of this section) are no longer valid. In that case one might even argue that the version of ŚB. shows us a more original and more divine Varuṇa and Bhṛgu. Bhṛgu's visit to the points of the compass is found in a quite different context at GB. 1, 1, 4, where he goes to the quarters after being created by Brahman. Even if this vague agreement is perhaps accidental, Bhṛgu's celestial position is once more illustrated. The purely human and terrestrial Bhṛgu of JB. may be comparatively young.

³ Compare JB. 2, 160 describing with exactly the same words (*sa ha tatāma. sa ha tāntaḥ param lokam jagāma. sa hāmuṣmin loke* ...) how the son of a sacrificer faints away and his "soul" goes to heaven (whereafter, meeting his deceased father there, he returns to earth). See E. Arbmänn, "Tod und Unsterblichkeit im vedischen Glauben", *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* 25 (1927), p. 357: "Bewusstlosigkeit ist die zeitweilige, Tod die dauernde und unwiderrufliche Trennung des Menschen vom Körper". For taking someone's breath of life see JB. 3, 168 f.; PB. 17, 12, 2.

⁴ The expression *param lokam jagāma* simply means "he passed away from this world", whereas *amuṣmin loka ājagāma* depicts the arrival in yonder world. That *asau loka* may be favourable as well as unfavourable becomes clear when one compares this passage with JB. 2, 160. Both *para-* and *asau loka-* refer to an indefinite yonder world in which the *svargaloka* may be included, but more often is excluded. Cf. M. A. Boyer, *J. As.* 1901, p. 486 f.; Gonda, *Loka*, p. 84 ff.

⁵ For *atha* after the gerund see Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, § 166 ff.

⁶ Geldner translates *abhiḥ batedaḥ kim svid idam* by "Ei, das war! Was war denn das?" Because of the initial position of *abhiḥ*, however, one should assume two questions (as is done by Oertel, o.c., p. 234 and Lévi, o.c., p. 101). Cf. Gonda, *Remarques sur la place du verbe dans la phrase active et moyenne en langue sanscrite* (Utrecht 1952), p. 14 f. ("Le verbe se trouve dans la position initiale dans une interrogation qui n'est pas introduite par une particule interrogative ou par un pronom").

⁷ The plural may indicate that the JB. version, in which a single man (and not as in ŚB. a group of men) performs the atrocities (and answers the question), is not the original and has carelessly borrowed from its source (either ŚB. or a common source).

⁸ *dvitīyam hājagāma*. Oertel, o.c., p. 234: "He came to a second". What should be supplied after "second"? Lommel remarks o.c., p. 94: "In Anlehnung an das Śatapatha-Brahmana könnte man dazu jedesmal das Femininum *diś* 'Himmelsgegend' ergänzen, und denken, dass da nach den 4 Hauptrichtungen noch 2 Zwischengegenden gemeint seien. Dann wäre die Jenseitsvorstellung in örtlichen Hinsicht wie im Śatapatha-Brahmana". How should *dvitīyam*, however, refer to a feminine noun? Moreover *ājagāma* is construed with the locative (*amuṣmin loke*) in the first paragraph. So it is improbable that *dvitīyam* would refer to a second yonder world, apart from the fact that, though there are many lokas (see Gonda, *Loka*, s.v. "plurality of lokas"), the expression *asau loka* occurs only in the singular. In this one yonder world Bhrgu arrives six times and every time meets with a different, particular loka, in accordance with the casuistic division of the merits and demerits. So *dvitīyam*, *trītiyam* etc. have to be taken adverbially with Lévi, o.c., p. 101 "en second lieu, en troisième lieu . . etc.". That this is correct, proves JB. 1, 43 *kim dvitīyam* (sc. *adarśas*) "What (did you see) secondly?"

⁹ On the reading of one of Oertel's mss. *tūṣṇīm vyāharantam* which I have adopted see n. 18.

¹⁰ *lohitakulyām ca ghṛtakulyām ca prabhūhuk syandamāne* is construed with *ājagāma* by Geldner, o.c., p. 78, who takes it as a second accusative after *pañcamam*. Oertel, o.c., p. 235 seems to interpret the participle as equivalent to a finite verb form, but does not account for the accusative. These words should, however, be taken with the following sentence as a disjunct accusative. See Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 78 "The proleptic accusative consists of a noun accompanied by a participle". The two accusatives are not wholly absolute as one of them depends on *jugopa*. The anacoluthon of this sentence is caused by *udacire*, which is not construed with an accusative.

¹¹ Read with Hoffmann, *K.Z.* 79, p. 172, n. 2 ("Die schlechte Überlieferung des JB. erlaubt ohne weiteres diese Korrektur von Hs. *udacire*") *udacire*.

¹² Oertel, o.c., p. 235 translates *pañca nadiḥ . . syandamānāḥ* "Five rivers . . (were) flowing", but rejects (*Syntax of Cases*, p. 19) the possibility "that, with the exception of the past participle in *-ta*, participles occur in the Brāhmaṇa prose in the clear rôle of finite verbs". So it is preferable to regard *pañca nadiḥ . . syandamānāḥ* as a pendent nominative which anticipates the locative *tāsu* (cf. Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 36).

¹³ *āgās* (as Oertel correctly reads) probably does not refer to his coming back (Oertel, Lévi and Geldner) but to his arriving somewhere. Just as *adarśas* is a short expression to which as object "something" or "it" should be supplied, so *āgās* implies "somewhere" or "there". The conciseness may be colloquial or euphemistic "there", i.e. "in those horrible places"; "it", i.e. "those atrocities after death".

¹⁴ Read with Oertel, o.c., p. 235 *kim tātāḥ iti* and not *kim tateti* (Raghu Vira). The son addresses his father with *tata*, the father his son with *tāta*.

¹⁵ The reading *juhvato* of some mss. (instead of *ajuhvato*) may be correct. The point is not that people do not offer the agnihotra, a sacrifice which is accepted even by the most a-ritualistic circles, but that the knowledge of its implications is lacking with some people. The opposite of *agnihotram juhvato naivamvidah* is *sa ya evam vidvān agnihotram juhvoti* (end of JB. 1, 44). If *ajuhvato* is read, the negation before *evamvidah* either is superfluous and irreg-

ular, or it separates *evamvidah* from *juhvato*, as appears from Oertel's, Lévi's and Geldner's translations. *evamvid agnihotram juhvoti* forms, however, one expression.

¹⁶ On this being eaten in return see ŚāṅkhB. 11, 3 (see Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 26, p. 196); JB. 1, 26 (see section 26-38, n. 1); 2, 182 (*JB. Auswahl*, p. 178 f.) *tāthā hainam amuṣmin loke paśavo nādanti. adanti ha vā amuṣmin loke paśavaḥ puruṣam*; ŚB. 12, 9, 1, 1 *sa yad dha vā asmin loke puruṣo nnam atti tad enam amuṣmin loke pratyatti*; Manu 5, 55 *mām sa bhakṣayitāmutra yasya mām sam ihādmy aham* and Ūrdhvāmnāya Saṃhitā 1, 10 (see Weber, o.c., p. 26, n. 2). Cf. also BhāṅP. 5, 26, 11 (see Scherman, o.c., p. 6, n. 2). For this motif in the folklore outside India see Lommel, *Paideuma* 4, p. 106 ff. and Oertel's paper "Altindische Parallelen zu abendländischen Erzählungsmotiven" in *Studien zur vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte* [Herausgegeben von Dr. Max Koch] VIII (1908), p. 120. The basic principle of this theme is the reversal of *agens* and *patiens* as part of the general, complete reversal in yonder world (see introduction).

The trees eat in return, because man has eaten them by means of the fire. So Lommel's remark "So wenig als Holzscheite Menschen Speise sind, so wenig können die Bäume hier Menschenfresser sein. Solche Abirrungen ergeben sich beim wiederholten Nacherzählen" (*Paideuma* 4, p. 97) is without foundation.

¹⁷ *kim dvitīyam* (sc. *adarśas*, to be supplied from *adarśas tātāḥ . . kim tātāḥ*). Cf. n. 8.

¹⁸ Some mss. read *vyāharantam* and *vyāharataḥ* without the privative particle *a-*. In the parallel passage ŚB. 11, 6, 1, 10 the plants are identified with the *tūṣṇīm āśinān* "still sitzende" (Weber, o.c., p. 25), "sitting still" (Eggeling). The *tertium comparationis* is, however, not the immobility of the plants, but (as appears from JB. and was rightly understood by Lommel, *Paideuma* 4, p. 98) their silence in contrast with the crying ones, the animals. Varenne's translation "assis et silencieux" (o.c., p. 136) does not express the durative aspect of *ās-*, which in connection with *tūṣṇīm* does not only mean "to keep quiet, remain motionless", (cf. BhāṅP. 8, 7, 4 *tūṣṇīm sthitān* "standing idly by; remaining inactive") but also "to remain silent". See Mayrhofer's *Concise Etym. Sanskrit Dict.* I, s.v. *tūṣṇīm* and compare JB. 2, 50 *yadā vai tūṣṇīm āste prāṇam eva vāg apyeti*; Pañcatantra 1, 2 *yāvāc chākhāgrair vāyuvāśād dhanyate, tāvac chabdam karoti, anyathā tūṣṇīm āste*. In the JB. version *tūṣṇīm* beside *avyāharantam* is pleonastic. Contrary to all translators and editors the forms without privative *a-* should be retained. The question is not so much that rice and barley, when harvested and cooked, do not cry, as that they cry inaudibly. Compare the use of *tūṣṇīm* in *tūṣṇīm śamsati*. The expiation *manasottarām āhutīm juhvoti* also does not imply mere silence, but may refer to the silent recitation of a formula. The same insertion of a privative *a-* occurs in some mss. JB. 1, 18 *avidvāmsam*; *ajānantam*; 1, 50 *idem*; 1, 43 f. *ajuhvataḥ*.

¹⁹ Read with Oertel *ajūgupaṭām* instead of *ajugupaṭām*.

²⁰ *ye vā asmin loke 'gnihotram (a)juhvato naivamvido 'śraddadhānā yajante tad aśraddhām gacchati yac chraddadhānās tac chraddhām*. Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 61 rightly takes this sentence as an instance of "The Anacoluthic Construction of Relative Clauses" and observes: "Note that the relative pronoun *ye* in the first half corresponds to the conjunction *yad* in the second". His translation "If any in this world, not offering the Agnihotra (and) not knowing thus, sacrifice without faith, — that (sacrifice of theirs) goes unto Non-Faith; if (they sacrifice) with faith that (Agnihotra goes) unto Faith", is, however, untenable. *agnihotram (a)juhvato naivamvido* must be taken with

asraddadhānāḥ as well as with *śraddadhānāḥ*. It is hardly conceivable that *tad* first means "(sacrifice)" and later on "(Agnihotra)" in the same sentence. Oertel's "that (sacrifice of theirs)" cannot refer to the agnihotra since he retains the reading *agnihotram ajuhvato*. His rendering *J.A.O.S.* 15, p. 237 "(...) that (sacrifice) goeth unto Non-Faith; what (they sacrifice) with faith, that (goeth) unto Faith" is more satisfactory (though *yad* "if, when" seems to be preferable). Geldner, who retains the privative *a-* in the rest of this passage, drops it here: "Wenn sie nämlich in dieser Welt zwar das Agnihotra darbringen, aber ohne richtige Erkenntnis und ohne Glauben opfern, so gelangt es zum Unglauben. Wenn aber einer im Glauben, so gelangt es zum Glauben" (o.c., p. 79). The constantly repeated, stereotyped turn of phrase *ye vā asmin loke 'gnihotram (a)juhvato naivamvidāḥ* should, however, consistently be read with or without *a-*. See n. 15. Moreover *naivamvidāḥ* should not be disjoined from the stock phrase and connected with *yajante*. Presumably *yajante* does not have any special relation to the agnihotra. It refers to sacrifices in general, such as the great soma sacrifices, where *śraddhā* plays a more important role and *yaj-* mostly is used (the agnihotra shows a preference for *hu-*). The meaning of *tad* here is "that (special sacrifice, i.e. the sacrifice of people who, not knowing the background of their agnihotra, sacrifice with or without faith)". Cf. ŚB. 3, 1, 1, 5 *ye brāhmaṇāḥ śuśrūvāṃso 'nucānā vidvāṃso yajayanti saivāhvālā* "If learned, instructed, knowing Brāhmaṇas perform the sacrifice there is no failure" (Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 60). Here *tad* is replaced by *sā* on account of the feminine predicate. One might also translate: "If learned (...) brahmins perform a sacrifice, that (sacrifice) is not a failure" or "the sacrifice of learned (...) brahmins is not a failure". Cf. also n. 23.

One may ask why reaching *śraddhā* is an evil for which a *niṣkṛti* has to be found. That is why Lommel, *Paideuma* 4, p. 98 observes: "... auch hier ist die Allegorie nicht recht gelungen; denn die Frau "Unglauben" ist ja gleich "Glauben" als Schatzhüterin hingestellt". According to Weber, o.c., p. 29 the two women originally were not Faith and Non-Faith "wie die priesterliche Deutung des Brāhmaṇa sie erklärt", but the keepers of good and evil. Whatever their original function may have been, in this text they are Faith and Non-Faith and as such have to be explained. Moreover both are here regarded as unfavourable (even Faith or the keeper of good). The one sacrifice goes to Faith, the other to Non-Faith, but both seem to be deposited in the one *mahad vittam* which is watched by the two women. The result of *śraddhā* and *asraddhā* in sacrifices apparently comes to the same thing and *śraddhā* is senseless, unless one knows the implications of the daily agnihotra. See also H. W. Köhler, *Śraddhā in der vedischen und alt-buddhistischen Literatur* (thesis Göttingen 1948), p. 66, n. 2: "Der Sinn scheint zu sein (...): Nicht dem Opferer selbst kommt der Lohn seiner Opfer und Werke zu gute, sondern im einen Fall der *Asr.*, im anderen der *Sr.*, wenn er nicht (...) grundsätzlich das Agnihotra darbringt und im besonderen bestimmte Sühneriten dabei beachtet, die gelehrt werden".

²¹ Read with Oertel *dvir āngulyā*.

²² As Oertel, o.c., p. 237, n. 100 observes, the perfect (*jugopa*) is very irregular in quotations. In Bhṛgu's narration *jaghāsa*, *jugupatuḥ*, *āsa*, *jugopa*, *udācīre* and *babhūva* are replaced by *aghaḥ*, *ajūgupaṭām*, *abhūt*, *jugopa* (sic), *udacante* (sic) and *abhūt*.

²³ *ye (...) brāhmaṇasya lohitam utpīḍayanti sā sā lohitakulyā*. For this construction see n. 20. Here *sā* for syntactical reasons stands for *tad* and is repeated in order to express that every drop of blood which is shed enters

that river. For an alternative interpretation — *utpīḍayati* literally means "to press out" — see n. 24.

²⁴ The black man seems to be Yama (Scherman, o.c., p. 7), here named Krodha. This identification is confirmed by Scherman's quotation (p. 8) from Laghucāṇakya (III, 8), where *krodhaḥ* occurring together with *trṣṇā*, *vidyā* and *saṃtoṣaḥ* is equated with *vaivasvato devaḥ*. All shed blood feeds the wrath of the revenging god of death. It is, however, also conceivable that the blood-river represents the blood pressed out of the brāhmaṇa-injurers, who in their turn suffer the same treatment which they had imparted on earth. In that case Wrath would be the symbol of the retaliation of the injured brahmins. His *musala-* then might be interpreted as a pestle (a meaning more usual than "club") with which he presses out (*utpīḍayati*) the blood of the sinners.

²⁵ Observe that a really favourable vision does not need a *niṣkṛti*, whereas *śraddhā* guarding the large property had to be expiated and therefore cannot but be unfavourable in the context (see n. 20).

²⁶ Gold means immortality. The golden men are the immortal agnihottrins who reap the fruits of their ritual *sukṛta* (apparently not taken by Faith and Non-Faith) in yonder world.

²⁷ On the construction see Renou, *Grammaire sanscrite*, p. 537: "Le groupe verbal (en *ta-*) suivi de substantif apposé [in this case a noun denoting milk may be supplied] peut équivaloir à un abstrait suivi d'un génitif" [here: "this taking (of the milk)"].

²⁸ Bhṛgu now has discovered that more study is superfluous. This does not imply a rejection of wisdom and a preference for the ritual. As a student Bhṛgu had only learnt ritual details. Varuṇa now made it clear to him that knowing the important implications and background of the rather simple agnihotra ritual secures immortality. So Bhṛgu decides to set up his fires as soon as possible, i.e. the next day.

²⁹ For *iṣṭāpūrta-* see Gonda, *Savayajñas*, p. 236 f.

45-46. (first half) and 49 (second half)-50. The doctrine of the five fires.

Eschatology

JB. 1, 45 dealing with the *pañcāgnividyā* has a close parallel in ŚB. 14, 9, 1, 12 ff. (= BĀU. 6, 1, 9 ff.); BĀU. 6, 2, 9 ff. (Kāṇva rec.) and ChU. 5, 4, ff. See Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 134 ff. for a translation of the JB. passage and a comparative table of the four versions (for a table of three versions, without JB., see also Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*, p. 138). On the meaning of this *pañcāgnividyā* within the framework of a water doctrine see *Agn. a. Prānāgn.*, ch. VI. Just as in the upaniṣadic parallels the *pañcāgnividyā* is followed by a description of the (twofold) path to heaven (1, 46). First some sort of *pitryāna* (of those who do not know the right answer on the question "Who art thou?") ending with the *ṛtus* (instead of the year which gives entrance to immortality) is sketched. This passage (the first half of 1, 46) is followed by an insertion on the ritual of death, with which will be dealt in the next section. The *devayāna* passage with the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo* .. starts as a sequel to the cremation as treated in the sūtra-like insertion (1, 49) and seems to be independent from the *pañcāgnividyā* passage. The two descriptions of the path to heaven, however, belong together, as appears from the last phrase of 1, 49 which is also found in 1, 46. JB. 1, 50 describes the correct reaction of the deceased on the question "Who art thou?". For a similar twofold reaction on this question (there asked by the sun itself) see JB. 1, 18. For this *devayāna* passage see the introduction of 17-18 (where further literature is given).

The following scheme may show the agreements and differences between the parallel versions of the *pañcāgnividyā*. It starts from the version of BĀU. (M.). The following signs are used. — means: identical; ≠ means: identical with minor variations such as *vr̥ṣṭih* / *varṣam*; ≠ ≠ means: identical with variations such as *parjanyaḥ* / *stanayitnuḥ*.

	BĀU. (M.)	BĀU. (K.)	ChU.	JB.
Fire	1 <i>asau lokah</i>	—	—	<i>ya eṣa tapati</i>
	2 <i>parjanyaḥ</i>	—	—	≠ ≠
	3 <i>ayam lokah</i>	—	<i>pr̥thivī</i>	<i>pr̥thivī</i>
	4 <i>puruṣaḥ</i>	—	—	—
	5 <i>yoṣā</i>	—	—	≠ ≠
Fuel	1 <i>ādityaḥ</i>	—	—	<i>rātriḥ</i>
	2 <i>saṃvatsaraḥ</i>	—	<i>vāyuh</i>	<i>dyauh</i>
	3 <i>pr̥thivī</i>	—	<i>saṃvatsaraḥ</i>	<i>antarikṣam</i>
	4 <i>vyāttam</i>	—	<i>vāk</i>	<i>vāk</i>
	5 <i>upasthaḥ</i>	—	—	≠
Smoke	1 <i>raśmayah</i>	—	—	—
	2 <i>abhrāṇi</i>	—	≠	—

	3 <i>vāyuh</i>	<i>agnih</i>	<i>ākāśaḥ</i>	—
	4 <i>prāṇaḥ</i>	—	—	—
	5 <i>lomāni</i>	—	<i>yad upa-</i> <i>mantrayate</i>	<i>iṣyāḥ</i>
Flame	1 <i>ahah</i>	—	—	—
	2 <i>vidyut</i>	—	—	—
	3 <i>rātriḥ</i>	—	—	<i>agnih</i>
	4 <i>vāk</i>	—	<i>jihvā</i>	<i>cakṣuḥ</i>
	5 <i>yonih</i>	—	—	<i>yonih</i>
Coals	1 <i>candramāḥ</i>	<i>diśaḥ</i>	—	—
	2 <i>aśaniḥ</i>	—	—	—
	3 <i>diśaḥ</i>	<i>candramāḥ</i>	—	—
	4 <i>cakṣuḥ</i>	—	—	<i>śrotram</i>
	5 <i>yad antaḥ</i> <i>karoti</i>	—	—	<i>samsparsaḥ</i>
Sparks	1 <i>nakṣatrāṇi</i>	<i>avāntaradiśaḥ</i>	—	—
	2 <i>hrādunayaḥ</i>	—	—	≠
	3 <i>avāntaradiśaḥ</i>	<i>nakṣatrāṇi</i>	—	<i>maricayaḥ</i>
	4 <i>śrotram</i>	—	—	<i>manas</i>
	5 <i>abhinandāḥ</i>	—	—	≠
Oblation	1 <i>śraddhā</i>	—	—	<i>amṛtam</i> <i>āpaḥ</i>
	2 <i>somaḥ</i>	≠	≠	≠
	3 <i>vr̥ṣṭih</i>	—	≠	—
	4 <i>annam</i>	—	—	—
	5 <i>retaḥ</i>	—	—	—
Result	<i>puruṣaḥ</i>	—	≠ ≠	—

Conclusions:

a) The Mādhy. and the Kāṇv. rec. are almost identical. Coals and Sparks 1 have been interchanged with Coals and Sparks 3. Only Smoke 3 (*agnih*) is different.

b) ChU. agrees with the Vājasaneyins rather than with JB. Only in two cases in which it differs from BĀU. there is an agreement with JB. (*pr̥thivī*; *vāk*).

c) The Fire and Fuel series of BĀU. and JB. have a different starting-point. The fivefold classification consists of two parts: the tripartition heaven — intermediate space — earth and man and woman. The oblation is poured into the whole range of the three parts of the cosmos, whereas in the case of man and woman only a special part (mouth; vulva) receives the offering. Compare ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 6 ff., where the agnihotra oblations enter *antarikṣam*, *dyauh* and *īyam*, which are at the same time their āhavanīya. On entering *puruṣaḥ* and *strī* they make the *mukham* and *upasthaḥ* their āhavanīya. In the present passage ŚB. bases itself on *puruṣaḥ* / *vyāttam* and *yoṣā* / *upasthaḥ* and creates the couples *asau lokah* / *ādityaḥ* and *ayam lokah* / *pr̥thivī*, in which *asau* and *ayam lokah* represent the totality and *ādityaḥ* and *pr̥thivī* the part. The second sacrifice with

parjanya and *saṃvatsaraḥ*, however, does not seem to fit in this structure. In JB. on the other hand the fuel in the first three sacrifices is not that special part of the fire on which the oblation is poured (compare the function of the *samidh* in the agnihotra ritual), but the wood which keeps the fire burning. The sun-fire is nourished by the darkness of the night, the thunder-fire by the atmosphere of heaven, the earth-fire by the atmosphere which covers the earth. The occurrence of *vāk* instead of *vyāttam* in the fourth sacrifice may be due to a tendency of the brāhmaṇas not to deviate from a fixed series — *vāk* is one of the five *prāṇāḥ* — even if inconsistencies arise in their classifications. Perhaps, however, these *prāṇāḥ* here do not denote the vital powers, but the orifices, and *vāk* refers to the mouth rather than to speech. In the two BĀU. recensions *vāk* (Flame 4) may, however, refer to speech, which sometimes is homologized with *agni*. ChU. seems to have borrowed *vāk* (Fuel 4) from JB. and to have replaced *vāk* (Flame 4) by *jihvā*, not one of the five *prāṇāḥ*, but chosen for its outward resemblance and also occurring (as *samidh*) in the five-fire doctrine ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 6 ff. Remarkably *prthivī* (Fire 3) in ChU. does not fit in the classification of the first three sacrifices, which for the rest agrees with ŚB. Again there may be influence from JB.

d) On account of Flame 3 (*rātriḥ*) the Kāṇva rec. has transposed *caṇḍramāḥ* and *nakṣatrāṇi* from the first to the third sacrifice.

e) Flame 3 (*rātriḥ*) is the counterpart of Flame 1 (*ahāḥ*) in BĀU. and ChU., just as *ayaṃ lokāḥ* of *asau lokāḥ* (BĀU.). The second sacrifice does not belong to this symmetric classification. JB., however, has a perfect triple division: *ahāḥ* "light produced by the sun", *vidyut* "light produced by thunder" and *agnih* "earthly light".

f) In the Kāṇva rec. Smoke 3 (*agnih*) is hardly tenable. Otherwise Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*, p. 138 assuming that "statt *vāyuh* mit Brh. *agnih* (Feuer in der Rolle des Rauches mochte anstössig befunden und daher verbessert werden), statt *saṃvatsaraḥ* mit Chand. *vāyuh* eingesetzt werden muss". Smoke 3 (*vāyuh*) is an excellent counterpart of Smoke 4 (*prāṇah*), whereas *agnih* is difficult to be explained as "smoke".

g) Against Deussen, o.c., p. 138 *saṃvatsaraḥ* should be retained as the original Fuel 2 of the upaniṣads (JB. differs in the Fire / Fuel series as was shown above). Since *vāyuh* evidently belongs to the third sacrifice, we are led to infer that *vāyuh* and *saṃvatsaraḥ* have been interchanged in ChU. In the second sacrifice *vāyuh* could easily replace *saṃvatsaraḥ* as fuel for *parjanya*, because wind, thunder and rain go together, whereas *saṃvatsaraḥ* as Fuel 3 could take the place of *prthivī* which had become vacant after the dropping of *ayaṃ lokāḥ*. For *vāyuh* Smoke 3 *ākāśah* forms a worthy substitute.

h) JB. has *maricayaḥ* (see Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, § 97 a) as Sparks 3 instead of *avāntaradiśaḥ*. In the same third sacrifice *antarikṣam* and *vāyuh* are occurring. For this combination see the *pañcāgnividyā* of ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 6 ff.

One may conclude that the two BĀU. versions are more or less identical. ChU. agrees with BĀU. in many respects, but shows some traceable

changes which may be due in part to influence from JB., and that the version of JB. though agreeing in several points with BĀU. is (especially in the first three sacrifices) based on a different, perhaps more original classification.

Obviously the first oblation *amṛtam āpah* (JB.) is more original than *śraddhā* (BĀU.; ChU.), as appears from the question *vettho yatīthyām āhutyām hutāyām āpah puruṣavāco bhūtva samutthāya vadanti* (BĀU. 6, 2, 2); *vettha yatīhā pañcamyām āhutāv āpah puruṣavacaso bhavanti* (ChU. 5, 3, 3). The waters to which this question refers are the original first oblation, which being successively transformed into soma, rain, food and semen produce a human being with a human voice at the fifth offering. The riddle question of the upaniṣads presupposes the reading *āpah* (with or without *amṛtam*, see n. 3) of the brāhmaṇa. Deussen, to whom the JB. parallel was unknown, considered (*The Philosophy of the Upanishads*, New York 1966², p. 334) *śraddhā* to be the immortal part of man which ascends to heaven from the funeral pyre and there is offered by the gods. "This immortal part is termed by Yājñavalkya *karman*, work, and in our passage is described after the analogy of the sacrificial fluid as "water", and later on as "faith". (...) They signify however essentially the same, inasmuch as the peculiar essence and so to speak the soul of the work (*karman*) that ascends as the sacrificial vapour (*āpas*) is the faith (*śraddhā*) with which it is offered". It is, however, not to be assumed that the first phase of an old water doctrine would be termed "waters" "after the analogy of the sacrificial fluid". Why should *śraddhā* especially be connected with the funeral "sacrifice" and therefore be equal to the *karman* of the dead even though this *śraddhā* rests, in fact, with the relatives who cremate him? The *āpah* are the heavenly waters. Originally the water doctrine was not cyclic. See *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. VI. There are no clear indications that in JB. the *pañcāgnividyā* was connected with the transmigration theory. On the other hand it is remarkable that the *pañcāgnividyā* which is mostly regarded as forming a secondary combination with the doctrine of the *pitṛ*- and *devayāna* in the upaniṣads in this section is similarly connected with two paths.

One may ask why in JB. this section was included in 1, 1-65 which deals with the agnihotra, whereas the upaniṣadic parallels do not have any relation to that rite. The funeral rites of the context and the fact that this eschatology starts from the cremation, which is often connected with the agnihotra, may be one of the reasons. Perhaps, however, one has to start from the *pañcāgnividyā*, which in JB. is not explicitly brought into connection with the agnihotra, but obviously refers to a fivefold agnihotra at ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 6 ff.

The upaniṣadic passages in which the transmigration doctrine plays an important role are obviously later than JB. This brāhmaṇa, however, need not be the direct, only source of these texts. In the brāhmaṇa itself the relation between the several passages is rather difficult. In the introduction of the section 17-18 it has already been observed that the passage with the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo* seems to form an insertion in JB. 1, 17-18. On the other hand the one Rtu who asks the question *ko*

'*si puruṣa* (I, 49) does not seem to agree with the plural vocative *ṛtavo* in the verse and with the fact that *Ṛtus*, and not one *Ṛtu*, lead the deceased to immortality. Presumably the original situation was the following: a) the *devayāna* passage starting at I, 49 as a sequel to the cremation; the deceased passes from smoke to night, to day, to the halves of the month, to the month and finally to the *Ṛtus* to whom he announces himself with the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo*; b) the deceased meets the sun and either gives the wrong answer to the question *kaś tvam asi* and is seized by the *Ṛtus*, or correctly answers and is released (JB. I, 18; JUB. 3, 3, 4, 1 ff.); c) the deceased, who has to pass night and day, the two halves of the month, the months, the *Ṛtus* and the year, meets one *Rtu*, does not give the correct answer to the question *ko 'si puruṣa* and is obstructed by that single *Ṛtu* (JB. I, 46); d) insertion of *devayāna* with the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo* in JB. I, 18; e) combination of the eschatologies of I, 46 and I, 49-50 in a *pitryāna* — *devayāna* couple as a result of which the announcement to the *Ṛtus* is replaced by the question *ko 'si puruṣa* of one *Ṛtu*.

The verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo* in the version of JB. I, 50 may contain some secondary additions. On the other hand, *trayodaśena dvādaśopamāsaḥ* of I, 50 seems to yield a more correct metre. ChU. and BĀU. more or less correspond to JB. I, 45 (for the end of 45 see ChU. 5, 9, 1 *iti nu pañcamyām āhutaṁ āpah puruṣavacaso bhavanti*; BĀU. 6, 2, 13 *tasyā āhuteḥ puruṣaḥ sambhavati*); I, 46 first paragraph (especially BĀU. 6, 2, 14); I, 49 (the path through the divisions of time divided into a dark and a bright one by the *upaniṣads*). KauṣU. I, 2 follows JB. I, 50 (the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo*). The verse *vicakṣaṇād* and the *pañcāgnividyā* refer to the same water doctrine which explains the origin of (human) life on earth. Both are found in an eschatological context in JB., but this text does not seem to contain any references to a never ending cycle of fluid, to a transmigration. The later assumption of a "Wasserkreislauf" in the *upaniṣads* involves claims by *kṣatriyas* to the authorship of this doctrine. On this point see *Agn. a. Prānāgn.*, ch. II and VI.

45. The one that shines here (the sun), that is Agni Vaiśvānara.¹ Its fuel is the night, its flame² the day, its smoke the rays of the sun, its sparks the stars, its coals the moon. In this same Agni Vaiśvānara the gods day by day offer immortality, the (heavenly) waters.³ From this oblation when it has been offered King Soma⁴ comes into existence.

The thunder is Agni Vaiśvānara. Its fuel is heaven, its flame the lightning, its smoke the clouds, its sparks the hailstones,⁵ its coals the thunderbolt. In this same Agni Vaiśvānara the gods day by day offer King Soma. From this oblation when it has been offered rain comes into existence.

The earth is Agni Vaiśvānara. Its fuel is the atmosphere, its flame

the fire, its smoke the wind, its sparks the shining motes in the air, its coals the quarters. In this same Agni Vaiśvānara the gods day by day offer rain. From this oblation when it has been offered food⁶ comes into existence.

Man is Agni Vaiśvānara. Its fuel is speech, its flame sight, its smoke breath, its sparks mind, its coals hearing. In this same Agni Vaiśvānara the gods day by day offer food. From this oblation when it has been offered seed comes into existence.

Woman⁷ is Agni Vaiśvānara. Its fuel is the vagina, its flame the vulva, its smoke desire (?),⁸ its sparks the feelings of enjoyment, its coals the coitus. In this same Agni Vaiśvānara the gods day by day offer seed. From this oblation when it has been offered man comes into existence.

Thus in this fifth creation man is born from the gods. At the fifth creation the divine waters speak with a human voice.⁹ And when⁹ he goes to yonder world —

46 — his (funeral) fire is Agni Vaiśvānara. Its fuel is the herbs and trees, its flame is just the flame (of the fire), its smoke just the smoke, its sparks just the sparks, its coals just the coals. In this same Agni Vaiśvānara the gods day by day offer man. From this oblation when it has been offered man comes into existence (and goes) to yonder world.¹⁰ That is for him the world in which he resurges.

Of that god who shines here¹¹ night and day, the half-months, the months, the seasons and the year are the guards. Night and day are forerunners (who announce his coming).¹² To¹³ him one of the seasons, who has a hammer in his hand,¹⁴ comes down along a ray of light and asks him: "Who art thou, man?"¹⁵ In case he has some (but not the perfect) knowledge he may withhold (his name from the interrogator).¹⁵ Then he strikes at him (with his hammer). Of him when he has been stopped the good works disappear in three parts.¹⁶ He (i.e. the *Ṛtu*) takes one third. One third diffuses in the air. Together with one third he (i.e. the deceased) descends in the direction of this world.¹⁷ The world which is won by him on account of his gifts, in that he stops. Thereupon even him Death ultimately reaches. Repeated dying is not overcome by him who¹⁸ knows (only) thus.

[...]

49. [...]

Of¹⁹ him when he has caught fire the smoke (*dhūma*) shakes off the body. Because it shakes off (*dhunoti*)²⁰ therefore it is *dhuna*. In

fact it is *dhūma* by name. They call it mystically²¹ *dhūma* in a mystic way of speaking. For the gods are fond of the mystic.²¹ From the smoke he goes to the night, from the night to the day, from the day to the half-month of the waning moon, from the half-month of the waning moon to the half-month of the waxing moon, from the half-month of the waxing moon to the month.²² There in the month both the body and the life-spirit come together.²³ To²⁴ him one of the seasons, who has a hammer in his hand, comes down along a ray of light and asks him: "Who art thou, man?"²⁴

50. Him he should answer:²⁵

"O, Seasons, from the radiant one, which is pressed out every half month, from the one which is connected with the pitṛs the seed is produced". — That they offer there the radiant King Soma, that (is meant by) this.²⁶

"As such you sent me in a man as your agent". — For they send him here in a man as their agent.

"From that man, your agent, you emitted me in a mother". — For he (the father) emits him in a mother.

"Thus I am produced, being added by the thirteenfold one as the additional month of the twelve".²⁷ — It is the thirteenfold one which burns here.

"This I know, of this I am sure. So lead me, O Seasons, to immortality, through²⁸ the twelve- or thirteenfold father, through this mother, through this faith, through this food, through this truth.²⁸ Day is my father, night my mother. I am truth.²⁹ So lead me, O Seasons, to immortality".

Him the seasons take with them. As one who knows one who likewise knows, as one who understands one who likewise understands³⁰ so the seasons take him with them. They admit him (to heaven)³¹ He who knows thus is not a human being; he is one of the gods if he has this knowledge.³² The fathers and grandfathers, swift as thought,³³ approach him (saying): "What, dear son,³⁴ have you brought us?" He should answer them: "Whatever good I have done that is yours". His sons enter upon his inheritance, his fathers upon (the effect of) his good deeds, his enemies upon (the effect of) his evil deeds.³⁵ Having thus made this threefold division he goes to co-existence in one world with the one that burns here.

NOTES

¹ Instead of *agnir vaiśvānaraḥ* BĀU. and ChU. have only *agnih*. The epithet *vaiśvānara*- (for which see Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, § 699 a) indicates that this fire is not just an ordinary sacrificial fire, but forms one of the manifestations of the cosmic power Agni. Cf. ŚB. 6, 6, 1, 5 (*vaiśvānara* = *sarve 'gnayaḥ*). See also ŚB. 10, 6, 1, where *prithivī*, *āpaḥ*, *ākāśaḥ*, *vāyuh*, *ādityaḥ* and *dyauh* are successively identified with Agni Vaiśvānara, but ultimately turn out to be only partial manifestations of that Agni Vaiśvānara which is the cosmic Puruṣa. This cosmic Agni is called Ātman Vaiśvānara in a later version of that passage (ChU. 5, 11 ff.)

² BĀU. and ChU. have *arcih* instead of *jyotiḥ*.

³ *amṛtam āpaḥ*. On the meaning of this first oblation and its relation to the version of the upaniṣads (which have *śraddhā* instead) see the introduction of this section. Probably *amṛtam* and *āpaḥ* are appositional rather than asyndetically placed together (and referring to two different oblations). They are often equated. See e.g. MS. 4, 1, 9: 11. 1; ŚB. 1, 9, 3, 7; 4, 4, 3, 15 *amṛtam vā āpaḥ*; GB. 2, 1, 3 *amṛtam āpaḥ*; AB. 8, 20, 1 *amṛtam vā etad asmiṃ loka yad āpaḥ*; ŚāṅkhB. 12, 1 *amṛtatvam vā āpaḥ*; ŚB. 3, 9, 4, 16; TB. 1, 7, 6, 3 *amṛtā hy āpaḥ*. It is interesting that not only *amṛtam*, but also *śraddhā* is associated with water. See e.g. MS. 4, 1, 4: 6.1; 1, 4, 10: 59.3 (KS. 32, 7; TS. 1, 6, 8, 1); TB. 3, 2, 4, 1. Frequently *śraddhā* is associated with *satyam* (see Lévi, *La doctrine du sacrifice*, p. 109), which itself is also identified with water (Lévi, o.c., p. 160). All these identifications seem to be based on the fact that the central conceptions of Vedic religion such as *ṛta*, *satya*, *brahman*, *tapas* etc. are situated in the heavenly waters (see Lüders, *Varuṇa* II, p. 644 ff.). The *śraddhā* which forms the first oblation in the upaniṣadic parallels may therefore be connected with those above-mentioned central conceptions, which are not only situated in the immortal, heavenly waters, but are also identical with them. Such abstract conceptions can be "rained" down to earth. Cf. ŚB. 11, 1, 6, 24 *dharmo vā āpas tasmād yademaṃ lokam āpa āgacchanti sarvam evedaṃ yathādharmam bhavaty atha yadāvṛṣṭir bhavati balīyān eva tarhy abalīyasa ādatte dharmo hy āpaḥ*. On account of the context in BĀU. and ChU. (notably the question on the waters which get a human voice after the fifth oblation) one may assume that originally *āpaḥ* formed the first oblation. The source of the upaniṣads may have read *śraddhām āpaḥ* (cf. JB. *amṛtam āpaḥ*). In spite of passages as JUB. 3, 3, 1, 4 *athaitat tṛtīyam mriyate yan mriyate sa śraddhām evābhisambhavati*; 3, 3, 1, 7 *tad etayā cainam śraddhayā samardhayati yayaivainam etac chraddhayāgnāv abhyādadhati* I do not think that *śraddhā* has to be connected with the cremation and that it makes the cycle complete. This *śraddhā* starting the stream of immortal fluid from heaven does not originate from earth. As an alternative explanation one might assume that the gods start this chain of sacrifices with a mental sacrifice in which *śraddhā* forms the immaterial (instead of the concrete) oblation out of which the fluid ultimately arises. See *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. V, n. 15.

⁴ For the position of Soma in the heavenly waters and its descent by way of rain see Lüders, *Varuṇa* II, p. 701 f. See also o.c. I, p. 202 ff. on the heavenly Soma and p. 239 referring to Soma as *apām garbhaḥ*.

⁵ *hlādunayaḥ*. See Oertel, o.c., p. 136.

⁶ Cf. ŚB. 2, 1, 1, 3 *annam hi vā āpas tasmād yademaṃ lokam āpa āgacchanty atehānnādyaṃ jāyate*. See further *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. VI B.

⁷ Read with Oertel *stry evāgnir* instead of *striyo vā agnir*.

⁸ *iṣyā*. See Oertel, o.c., p. 136.

⁹ Oertel's translation "at the fifth creation the divine waters endowed with human speech say how he proceeds to yonder world" (o.c., p. 135) is quite untenable in view of ChU. 5, 9, 1 *iti nu pañcamyām āhūtāv āpaḥ puruṣavacaso bhavanti*. Instead of cancelling *atha* (as Oertel does) one may conjecture *yadā* for *yathā*. Cf. BĀU. 6, 2, 13-14 *atha yadā mriyate — athainam agnaye haranti tasyāgnir evāgnir bhavati* . . etc.

¹⁰ Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 136 observes that the acc. *amum lokam* is odd. Either a loc. would be expected, or the preposition *abhi* should be supplied. The phrase *tasyā āhuter hutāyāi . . sambhavati* is, however, stereotyped in this passage. Moreover coming into existence in this series of sacrifices takes place on the spot where is sacrificed. The rain e.g., which is the result of sacrificing soma in the atmosphere, comes into existence in the atmosphere and only afterwards reaches the earth. So the *puruṣa* is not born in yonder world (loc.), but comes into existence out of the pyre and thence arises to yonder world (acc.). The stereotyped phrasing of this passage prevented the author from expressing himself in a more exact way. That may be the reason why he adds: *so 'sya lokah punarutthāyāi bhavati* "That (yonder) world is for his resurrection", i.e. "there his coming into existence is realized in fact".

¹¹ *tasya haitasya devasya* (initial position) and *ya eṣa tapati* (final position) belong together. The predicative noun *goptā* (sing.) is congruent with the last of the series of subjects, *saṃvatsaraḥ* (sing.). See Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 87; Speyer, *Ved. u. Sanskrit-Syntax*, p. 31. The year is the last obstacle. Gaining or reaching the year means obtaining immortality. Cf. ŚB. 11, 1, 2, 12 *martyā ha vā agre devā āsuh. sa yadaiva te saṃvatsaram āpur athāmṛtā āsuh sarvaṃ vai saṃvatsaraḥ sarvaṃ vā akṣayyam eteno hāsyaḥ akṣayyam sukrtaṃ bhavaty akṣayyo lokah*; JB. 1, 252 *sa haivaṃ vidvān ahorātrayor ardhamaśaśo māśaśa rṥuśa saṃvatsaraśa etasmin sarvasminn ātmānam upasaṃdhāya tam mṛtyuṃ tarati yas sarge loke na haivaṃvīt punar mriyate*.

¹² Text and translation are doubtful. Caland conjectured *pracaret* for *pracare* in his transcript of the ms. Burnell 421 (Univ. Libr. Utrecht, Caland mss. nr. 6), which hardly makes more sense. Perhaps *pracare* (dual) refers to the function of night and day, which are forerunners announcing the visitor to the more important guards, the *Ṛtus*, who send one of them to examine the deceased.

¹³ The same sentence is found at the end of JB. 1, 49. See the introduction of this section.

¹⁴ The meaning of *kūṭa-* in *kūṭahasta-* is "hammer". See Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 19, p. 114, n. 2. A. K. Coomaraswamy, *I.H.Q.* 14, p. 53, n. 60 starting from *kūṭa-* "roof-plate" concludes: "... since the Season descends from the sun and is the messenger of the solar Judge, we suppose again that this means that he has in hand as his weapon a *discus*, analogous to the solar disc, which is the roof-plate of the universe. (...) *kūṭahasta* then is tantamount to 'armed with the sun'". He does not, however, explain the relation between sun in heaven and sun as a weapon. Moreover a disc is hardly a striking-weapon (*tasya ha praharati!*). For *kūṭa-* meaning "hammer" see e.g. JB. 2, 90 (JB. *Auswahl*, p. 149 f.) *tad yathā mayūkhena vā tikṣṇenābhinihāya śaṅkunā vā kūṭenābhinihanyād . . tad yathāgnināśmānam abhyoṣya tam kūṭena bhinidyād* . . For the hammer in sun- and death-cult see H. Hartmann, *Der Totenkult in Irland* (Heidelberg 1952), p. 89. Yama's messengers likewise bear a hammer MärkP. 10, 59 (see Scherman, *Ind. Visionslitt.*, p. 27).

¹⁵ *sa kim vidvān pravrñjyāt*. In this difficult sentence *sa* seems to refer to the deceased, whose reaction on the question is described. The only correct answer is the verse *vicakṣaṇād* (1, 50). Answering by personal or family

name is completely wrong (cf. 1, 18). Does this passage represent something between the two? The dead does not reach the sun. On the other hand he is allowed to live on in his reserved *loka*, but not in eternity: *anavajito hāsya punarmṛtyur bhavati sa ya evaṃvīt syāt*. Evidently *evaṃvīt* refers to *kim vidvān*. Here *kim* (hardly to be taken as the interrogative pronoun) may express inferiority or deficiency as in compounds and in *kim adhite* (Kāś. on Pāṇ. 8, 1, 44 quoted by M.-W.). The *kimvidvān* and the *evaṃvīt* of 1, 46 who has only a mediocre knowledge is to be compared to the *evaṃvīt* of 1, 50 (*sa haṣa na manuṣyo ya evaṃ veda. devānām ha vai sa eko ya evaṃvīt*). The interpretation of *pra-vrj-* forms a problem. Mostly this verb is used in its ritualistic sense ("to put on the fire"). Moreover the root *vrj-* has several significations. For one of the few passages in which *pra-vrj-* occurs without any reference to fires see JB. 1, 61 *prāco nvā ayaṃ yajamānasya prāṇān prāvṛkṣan mṛṣyaty ayaṃ yajamānaḥ*. The parallel passage ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 6 has *prāco nvā ayaṃ yajamānasya prāṇān prāvṛtsit*. Does *pra-rudh-* here mean "to hold back" and may *pra-vrj-* have the meaning "to hold back, keep back, withhold something from a person, suppress or conceal information" (here referring to withholding his name when asked for it)? According to M.-W. the *ātmanepadam* of *vrj-* may denote "to keep anything from". The meaning "to strike down" which is used in Eggeling's translation of ŚB. 1, 3, 3, 14 would, if applied in the present passage, require the *Ṛtu* as subject. This would imply a completely different interpretation of this passage in which the Season, if he should have got some information (*sa kim vidvān*) in the form of an answer which mentions the name, would strike down, exclude or throw out (a meaning also suitable at ŚB. 3, 2, 4, 13 and JB. 1, 61) the deceased.

¹⁶ A different threefold division is found 1, 50. Here the *Ṛtu* seems to take one third (and go back to heaven), one third disappears on the spot and with one third the deceased descends in the direction of the earth. A triple division is often connected with the three worlds.

¹⁷ I render "in the direction of this world", because reaching the earth seems to be excluded here. The words *mṛtyur evāntata āpnoti* and *punarmṛtyu-* obviously point to a life in yonder world (but not in the highest heaven which is reserved for the immortals). The dead is obstructed by the *Ṛtu*, falls back in the direction of the earth, but stops (*niramate*) in a *loka* which he has won by his gifts.

¹⁸ *sa* is superfluous in *sa ya evaṃvīt syāt*, since *asya* is the antecedent. Cf. 1, 9 *sa yathāhir ahicchavyai nirmucyeta* (...) *evam eva sarvasmāt pāpmano nirmucyeta sa ya evaṃ vidvān agnihotraṃ juhote*, where *sa* resumes the antecedent. It seems to be used on the analogy of those cases in which the relative clause precedes the main clause. See e.g. 1, 18 *sa yo ha . . tam hāha*; 1, 44 *sa ya evaṃ vidvān agnihotraṃ juhote nainam amuṣmin loke* . . There *sa* may be taken as a nominative pendens, but perhaps it already forms the first phase of the so-called expletive *sa*. According to Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 119 a this *sa* ("dit expletif ou initial figé") does not occur outside ŚB. but in BSS., VādhS. and twice in AB. He observes that "l'extension réelle du procédé nous échappe (Ren. J. As. 1937, 332 n. 2)". In JB., however, some instances of this use can be found. In the last 65 chapters of the second book, which I have checked as a counterpart of 1, 1-65, I have noticed 2, 403 *sa yathā śāradam ukṣānam vāgarābhīḥ paritatyālabherann evam evaitad parimādbhir mahāuratam ālabhante*; 2, 434 *sa yatra ṣoḍaśinam kuryur arṣo vaiṣāṃ jāyeta varāhma vā*; 2, 435 *sa yad atra ṣoḍaśinam kuryur dvāvīmśatiḥ caikavīmśās saṃpadyeran*; 2, 439 *sa yathā pitarau putram pūrvam yantam paścād anvi-*

yātām tādyk. In JB. 1, 1-65 such clear instances are lacking, but that does not prove this use was unknown to the author of the agnihotra section. In several cases in which *sa* can be explained as having a function in the sentence the possibility is not excluded that this "functional" use of *sa* is accidental or not felt as such. An exhaustive study of the initial words in the sentence pattern of the Vedic prose will undoubtedly throw light on this matter and establish a definite relationship between texts (and their subdivisions). Probably many agreements between JB. and ŚB. will be found. JB. shows a tendency to open its sentences with *sa ya*, *sa yathā* etc. The following possibilities are found:

- sa ya* — *sa* subject of the main clause.
- sa ya* — *sa* resumed by *sa* or *esa* in the main clause.
- sa ya* — *sa* resumed by *asya*, *tasya*, *tam* etc.
- sa ya* — *sa* resumed, but not by a pronoun. See e.g. JB. 3, 372 *sa yo ha sa puruṣaḥ* (thus should be read) *ya evaṃ vedaivamvidi ha vai prāṇaḥ pratiṣṭitāḥ*.
- sa ya* — *sa* in the turn of phrase *sa yaḥ . . brūyād (anuvyāhared) . . tathā haiva syād (syuh)*. See e.g. 1, 61; 335; 2, 32; 37; 434; 436. See also Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 55 ff. quoting no instances of *sa ya* from AB., which has only *ya* (against ŚāṅkhB.; ŚB.; Up.).
- sa yathā* (*yadā*, *yatra*, *yadi*, *yāvad*, *yad*, *yam*, *yām*, *yad* etc.)
 - *sa* subject of the main clause (sporadically resumed by *esa*).
 - *sa* subject of the subordinate clause.
 - *sa* subject of the main as well as of the subordinate clause.

It is worth mentioning that especially in the *sa yathā* sentences one may often doubt if *sa* has to be considered the subject of the subordinate clause. A comparison of the *sa yathā* with the *tad yathā* sentence pattern would be useful. A statistic research of several brāhmaṇas together with an investigation of a limited number of contexts might yield interesting results. That *sa* often can be taken as the subject of the *yathā* clause need not surprise us, since in comparisons the subject mostly is "one" (French "on", Sanskrit *sa*). In a sentence as JB. 2, 386 *sa yathā putraḥ pitṛn anusamcāret tādyg evaitad* probably *sa* should not be taken with *putraḥ* and is as superfluous as at JB. 1, 341 *sa yathā kṣatram vidvad rājaputravat syāt tādyk tat* (cf. also 2, 2 *sa yathā . . pāteyur . . evaivam tad yad . . upayanti*). The same problem arises in connection with *sa yad*. In these ritualistic texts *sa* often can be explained as "he, the sacrificer" or "he, the officiant". It is, however, conceivable that *sa* sometimes only makes a distinction with the *tad yad* sentences, *tad yad* meaning "thereby that (he)", *sa yad* "if (when) he". *sa* seems to be quite superfluous before the rel. pron. *yad* JB. 2, 68 *sa yad evāsmiṇ dīkṣite yaśo bhavati tad asmiṇ utthite yaśo bhavati*. The difference with *tad yad . . tad* may, however, be that the latter construction means "that which . . that", whereas *sa yad . . tad* implies "if any (i.e. whatever) . . that". All these different uses of *sa* before *ya*, *yathā*, *yad* etc., favoured by the tendency to begin sentences with a demonstrative pronoun and to place *ya*, *yathā*, *yad* etc. on the second place — *sa ya* etc. is often taken up by *atha ya* throughout a whole chapter — have resulted in a superfluous, indeclinable *sa*, used for stylistic reasons. In *sa yat prathamam upamārṣṭi tena gandharvāpsarasah prīṇāti* (JB. 1, 41) the author could as well have written *tad yat prathamam . .* Just as *sa yathā* and *tad yathā* one should also compare *sa yad* and *tad yad* in Vedic prose. Not only at the beginning, but also in the middle of a sentence

sa may precede *ya*, *yathā* etc. See e.g. JB. 1, 41 *atha yad dvir angulyā prāśnāti sa yat prathamam prāśnāti tena prāṇāpānu tyajataḥ*. Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 20 considers ChU. 5, 1, 12 *atha ha prāna uccikramiṣant sa yathā suhayaḥ paḍbīśaṅkhūnt samkḥided evam itarān prāṇānt samakhidat* ("Then breath, getting ready to depart, — it, as a fine steed would . .", tr. Oertel) to be an instance of the proleptic nominative construction. Here *sa*, however, hardly has the force of a resumptive pronoun, but is placed before *yathā* just as at the beginning of sentences. The same may be said of *sa* in the present passage, in which it seems to throw into relief the conditional force of the relative pronoun. According to Keith, *Rigveda Brahmanas*, p. 291, n. 2 the use of this superfluous *sa* (in *sa yadi*) is a sign of lateness.

¹⁹ After the sūtra-like insertion without any brāhmaṇa features the text at once continues with a typical brāhmaṇa etymology. On these "etymologies" see Gonda, *Lingua* 5, p. 61 and Lévi, *Doctrine du sacrifice*, p. 38, n. 6.

²⁰ On shaking off the body see also JB. 1, 252 *sa eṣo 'pahatapāpmā dhūta-śarīro 'tīyaitam mṛtyum śarīram dhūnute*; JUB. 3, 6, 2, 2 *śarīraṇy adhūnot*; 3, 7, 2, 1 f. *kalāśa evāśya tac charīraṇy adhūnot. sa eṣo 'pahatapāpmā dhūtaśarīraḥ*; AB. 4, 24, 1 *śarīram eva tābhīr dhūnute*. Remarkably the present passage (*śarīram dhūnoti*) uses the active form with *u* instead of *ū*. This may imply that JB. 1, 49 and 252 do not belong to the same stage of this brāhmaṇa. See also Oertel, *JB. Roots and Verb. Forms*, p. 39.

²¹ For this phrase occurring with some differences ŚB., TB., AB., GB. and AĀ. see Keith, *The Aitareya Āraṇyaka* (Oxford 1909), p. 232, n. 14. Remarkably ŚB. invariably has *parokṣam* and *parokṣakāmāḥ* against *parokṣena* and *parokṣapriyāḥ* of the other texts. It agrees only once (14, 6, 11, 2) with them. As the phrase does not occur in the first five books and in a different form in the upaniṣad, it may give a clue for the relation of (parts of) texts. Here JB. *iti parokṣam ācakṣate parokṣenaiva parokṣapriyā iva hi devāḥ* by its double use of the adverb to some extent combines the two versions. Again an agreement between these two brāhmaṇas. JUB. frequently has *parokṣam* (without the addition *parokṣapriyāḥ hi devāḥ*). For *parokṣeneva* see JUB. 3, 3, 2, 6. According to Schrapel, *Untersuchung der Partikel iva* (thesis Marburg 1970), p. 18 (referring to JB. 2, 419) in this connection *iva* should mean "noch" ("mit noch einem Hintersinn"). I doubt, however, if his rendering of *parokṣapriyā iva hi devāḥ* (ŚB. 14, 6, 11, 2) "Denn die Götter lieben, was noch einen Hintersinn hat" is correct. One would expect (if this interpretation of *iva* would be accepted) a translation: "Denn die Götter lieben noch, was einen Hintersinn hat". This phrase is also found in VādhS. (A.O. 6, p. 111 . . . *ity ācakṣate parokṣena parokṣapriyā iva hi devāḥ*; cf. also p. 120).

²² The later versions of the upaniṣads (BĀU.; ChU.) divide this path into a dark side (the *pitṛyāna*) and a bright one (the *devayāna*). On this division see also VādhS. 4, 28 a (A.O. 6, p. 133), where the dark half of the year, of the month (*avāchannāparapakṣa*, cf. JB. *apocchantipakṣa*) and of the day is connected with the pitṛs. ŚB. 2, 1, 3, 1 ff. three seasons are associated with the pitṛs, three with the gods. The uniform path (JB.; KauṣU.) ending with the examination by the doorkeeper is definitely older. A similar course through the divisions of time is found JB. 1, 46.

²³ Cf. section 17-18, n. 14.

²⁴ See n. 13.

²⁵ See the introduction and section 17-18 on this verse.

²⁶ *yad ado vicakṣaṇam somam rājānam juhvati tat tat*. Windisch' rendering (o.c., p. 118) "Was sie dort dem Weisen, dem König Soma opfern, alles das (bildet den Samen)" is untenable. More or less correct are the translations by

Oertel, o.c., p. 113; Frenz, o.c., p. 128 and Hertel, o.c., p. 155. The last-named scholar observes in a note: "Diese falschen Erklärungen zeigen dass schon dem Verfasser des Brāhmaṇa der Sinn der Verse nicht mehr klar war". The author of the brāhmaṇa, however, gives a better interpretation of the verse than some modern scholars. The present forms *juhvati*, *erayante* and *āsiñcanti* fairly agree with the injunctives of the verse (which may have formed one of the reasons of these explanations). Obviously *adas* means "there, in heaven" against *etat* "here, on earth" in the next explanation *pumsī hy enam etat kartary erayante*. The author correctly takes *prasutāt* as derived from *pra-su* "to press". The Seasons offer King Soma just as the gods in the *pañcāgnividyā* (second sacrifice). Man is produced by the representatives of Time, which together form the Year (= the Sun, which also plays a role in this context). The semen, King Soma, is sometimes likewise equated with the year, e.g. TB. 1, 6, 8, 2 *saṃvatsaro vai somaḥ pitṛmān*.

²⁷ *trayodaśena dvādaśopamāsaḥ* instead of JB. 1, 18 *dvādaśena trayodaśopamāsaḥ*. Cf. also *dvādaśatrayodaśena pitṛā* in this context and KauṣU. 1, 2 *dvādaśatrayodaśa upamāso dvādaśatrayodaśena pitṛā*. Oertel, o.c., p. 118 prefers the version of 1, 50 on account of its meaning. According to Windisch, o.c., p. 121 the numerals have been transposed and 1, 50 represents the original text, whereas Hertel, o.c., p. 152, n. 2 is in favour of the opposite view. Renou, *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad*, p. 19, n. 29 taking KauṣU. as a combination of the two JB. versions on account of the compound *dvādaśatrayodaśa-* (a wrong argument since *dvādaśatrayodaśena pitṛā* already occurs JB. 1, 50) states: "de toute manière JB., 1, 50, 1 est une corruption de 18, 2". He does not, however, adduce any arguments for this assertion. This verse is undoubtedly older than both JB. passages. Some small differences in the transmission of this verse do not prove anything on the relation between the complete passages. The verse and its context are inserted in JB. 1, 18, whereas the version of 1, 50 may have added some phrases to the end of the verse (see the introductory note). The differences between the two versions in this particular line seem to imply that JB. 1, 50 is more original. The numerals *dvādaśa-* and *trayodaśa-* being unaccented here may signify "twelfth", "thirteenth" or "twelve". "thirteen", but also "twelffold", "thirtefold". Therefore several translations are possible. As a designation of the year *trayodaśa-* and *dvādaśa-* are, though the year is mostly regarded as twelffold, equally admissible. See e.g. ŚB. 14, 1, 3, 28 *trayodaśa sampādayati trayodaśa vai māsaḥ saṃvatsarasya saṃvatsara eṣa ya eṣa tapati* (cf. JB. 1, 50 *eṣa trayodaśo ya eṣa tapati*). JB. 1, 18 *trayodaśopamāsaḥ* only admits of the dubious interpretation "thirteenth (intercalary) month". whereas *dvādaśopamāsaḥ* may be interpreted as "additional month of the twelffold (year)/of the twelve (other months)/of the twelfth (month)". Moreover the metre favours *trayodaśena dvādaśopamāsaḥ* (— — — —, — — / — — — —) rather than *dvādaśena trayodaśopamāsaḥ* (— — — —, — — — / — — — —).

²⁸ Windisch, o.c., p. 122 (who is followed by Frenz, o.c., p. 128) takes *tayā mātṛā tayā śṛaddhāyā tenānnādyena tena satyena* as "durch das Manenopfer (*śṛaddhā*) als die Mutter, durch die Wahrheit als Speise und Trank". Probably, however, *śṛaddhā*, *annādyam*, *satyam* and in the KauṣU. parallel *tapas* are so-called "Zentralbegriffe" (Lüders, *Varuṇa*, p. 644 ff.) which are to be localized in heaven, in the heavenly waters, and are identical with the *Ṛta* and (later) *Brahman*. The thirtefold (= the Year, the Sun, the Highest Principle) is the father, but at the same time the mother, it is Faith, Food, Reality (Truth), Tapas etc. This duality in unity of the Year (= Time) as father/mother seems to be expressed by "Day is my father,

night is my mother" i.e. "Time represents my parents". For *dvādaśatrayodaśena pitṛā tayā mātṛā* perhaps meaning "by the twelve- or thirtefold one who is the father, the same who is the mother" one may compare JUB. 1, 13, 2, 4 . . *aditir mātā sa pitā sa putrah* "Aditi is the mother, she is the father, she is the son" (tr. Oertel). The instrumentals, in the context to be translated by "through" and to be construed with *ānayadhvam*, originally may have formed an addition (or gloss) to the instrumental *trayodaśena* (the father by whom man is produced as an additional month).

²⁹ *satyam asmi*. Cf. KauṣU. 1, 6 *yas tvam asi so 'ham asmiṭi tam āha ko 'ham asmiṭi satyam iti*. The equivalent of *satyam* is the *Ṛta*, the highest principle.

³⁰ Read with the crit. ed. *vidvāmsam* and *jānantam* (see section 17-18, n. 28). Frenz, o.c., p. 127, n. 36 is not right in assuming a "Bild vom Reisenden und Reiseführer". The *Ṛtus* accept the deceased "who knows thus" as an initiated, as one of their own people. It is to be noted that middle forms (*ānayante*; *atyarjayante*) are used, whereas active forms would be more suitable in the case of hired "Reiseführer". Does *ānayate* refer to introducing an initiated, accepted person to the own group and to admitting him in their midst ("let me come; take me with you")?

³¹ This verb is found only in AB. among the brāhmaṇas. It occurs as *atyarjati/e* (but the tenth present class does not seem to change the meaning of *arj-*). AB. 1, 10 and 3, 42 the verb is used in a similar context (admittance to heaven).

³² Cf. ŚB. 10, 3, 5, 13 *sa ha sa na manuṣyo ya evaṃvid devānām haiva sa ekaḥ*.

³³ Cf. Caland, *Altindischer Ahnencult* (Leiden 1893), p. 11: "Beim saṃsādanam gebraucht er den spruch: *yantu pitaro yathālokaṃ manasā javena*".

³⁴ Instead of *tataḥ* Thieme, *Wiss. Zs. Univ. Halle-Wittenberg* I, 3 (1951/52), p. 27, n. 5 reads *tata*. Notice, however, that JB. 1, 43 (Bhṛgu story) *tata* is used in addressing the father, whereas the son is addressed with *tāta*. See also JB. 2, 9 on *tata* "father". We have accepted Thieme's emendation with some doubts. If *tataḥ* is retained, it either denotes "therefrom, from the earth", or it is used as in the turn of phrase *kiṃ nas tato bhaviṣyate* (ŚB. 8, 4, 2, 2; for parallels and variants see Oertel, *Z.I.I.* 5, p. 123).

³⁵ Cf. JB. 1, 18; KauṣU. 1, 4; Manu 6, 79 (see Thieme, *Wiss. Zs. Halle-Wittenberg* I, 3, p. 29, n. 1).

46 (end)–49 (first half). *The funeral rites*

Literature: Caland, *Die Altindischen Todten- und Bestattungsgebräuche*, Amsterdam Academy 1896 (hereafter called *Bestattungsgebräuche*). Kane, *History of Dharmaśāstra* IV (Poona 1953), p. 179 ff. *Śrautakośa* I, Sanskrit / English Section (Poona 1958 / 1962), p. 764 ff. / 1033 ff. Caland, *The Pitṛmedhasūtras of Baudhāyana, Hiranyakeśin, Gautama* (Abh. K.M. 10/3), Leipzig 1896. Idem, *Das Śrautasūtra des Āpastamba* III (Amsterdam Academy 1928), p. 420 ff. [tr. of ĀpŚS. 31, the pitṛmedhasūtra, which is almost identical to HirPiS. and BhārPiS.]. C. H. Raabe, *Bijdrage tot de kennis van het Hindoesche doodenritueel*, Leiden 1911 [thesis Utrecht containing the crit. ed. of BPiS. 2 and 3, the secondary BPiS.]. C. G. Kashikar, *The Śrauta, Pitṛmedhika and Pariśeṣa Sūtras of Bhāradvāja* I (Text), p. 227 ff.; II (Translation), p. 460 ff. (Poona 1964) [Introduction of the Text, p. XLIV ff., contains a revised reprint of a paper on BhārPiS., HirPiS. and ĀpPiS., read at the 20th A.I.O.C. and published J.O.R.M. 28 (1958/59), p. 1 ff. The author proves that the other two sūtras are mere borrowings from BhārPiS.]. Hillebrandt, *Ritualliteratur*, p. 87 ff. For an edition and translation of the present section see Oertel, J.A.O.S. 19 (1988), p. 103 ff. For a translation of JB. 1, 49 see also Hertel, *Die Weisheit der Upanischaden*, p. 153 ff. and A. Frenz, I.I.J. 11 (1969), p. 127 f.

The funeral rites belong to the saṃskāras and consequently are described in the grhya sūtras or in separate pitṛmedha sūtras. Some śrauta sūtras, however, also deal with this ritual, which may relate to the āhitāgni. Its mantras are found in RV., AV. and TĀ. Among the brāhmaṇas ŚB. is the only text which contains a full treatment of the ritual of death. It starts (ŚB. 12, 5, 1) with an agnihotra expiation (the death of the agnihotrin abroad; cf. AB. 7, 2). The description of the ritual (ŚB. 12, 5, 2) agrees with the present JB. section with regard to the ritualistic details. The great difference, however, is that the passage in ŚB. has all the characteristics of a brāhmaṇa, whereas the JB. section in no respect is distinguishable from a sūtra. The only brāhmaṇa-like passages are the end of 1, 47 *so 'ta āhutimayo* . . etc., which evidently has been taken from JB. 1, 2, and the end of this section dealing with the inflammation of the corpse by the three fires and its meaning (this is, however, also found in several sūtras). This section may be regarded as an insertion from a sūtra; an insertion made in an eschatological context in which cremation plays a role (beginning of JB. 1, 46; cf. also the beginning of JB. 1, 18, where the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo* follows as in this context in JB. 1, 50).

The Jaiminiyas also deal with the funeral ceremonies in their grhya-sūtra (JGS. 2, 4). See Caland, *De literatuur van den Sāmaveda en het Jaiminigrhyasūtra*, Amsterdam Academy 1905 [hereafter referred to as JGS. ed.]; see especially p. 9 ff. of the introduction with regard to the cremation] and *The Jaiminigrhyasūtra*, Lahore 1922 [hereafter to be called JGS. ed./tr.; besides the text and the English version of the introduction

of JGS. ed., it contains an English translation; for the present subject see p. VII]. The sūtra-like insertion in JB. cannot have belonged to JGS. (as it is transmitted to us) since the sūtra refers to the brāhmaṇa.

Strangely enough Śrinivāsa's commentary on JGS., called Subodhini (for extracts see Caland's ed. and ed./tr.), while dealing with the funeral ritual, comments on the present section in JB. The ms. of the Subodhini is found in the India Office. I have used Caland's transcript (Univ. Libr. Utrecht, Caland MSS., not listed). For the following discussion of this commentary see also Caland's extracts at the end of the two editions and his remarks in the introductions.

After dealing with JGS. 2, 3 it announces *itaḥ param āhitāgneḥ śarīra-nāṣe ityādi* (see beginning of JGS. 2, 4) *dahanādisāpindavyāntavidhāyaka-sūtrāny ante vyākhyāsyāmaḥ*. Indeed it comments on JGS. 2, 4 (announced by *atha dahanapaṭalo vyākhyāyate*) at the end (after 2, 8 *anaśnat-samhitākalpaḥ*; it does not seem to have known 2, 7 and 9). Śrinivāsa may have deliberately transferred the funeral ritual to the end (*ante*) in order to insert without restraint a lengthy brāhmaṇa passage without disturbing the total composition too much. He correctly observes that the sūtra first deals with the āhitāgni whose corpse is lost and then with the *anaśtaśarīra* (*sati śarīra ityādinā*; the printed text reads *satīśarīram*; see Caland's crit. app.). After the treatment of the *naśtaśarīra*, however, the commentary on the *anaśtaśarīra*'s funeral rites does not refer to *satīśarīram* (r. *sati śarīra*) *uptakeśam* . ., but deals with the present JB. section (introduced by *atha āhitāgneḥ kramasaṃskāra ucyate*): *sa yadopatāpī syād* . . etc. (JB. 1, 46 end – 48; some references to 1, 49). It is to be noted that the JB. quotation correctly starts with *sa yadopatāpī*, whereas the sūtra itself contains in 2, 4 a quotation (*ya evamvīt syāt sa yadopatāpī syād*) which surprisingly includes the last words of the preceding section. As to the significance of the commentary with regard to the details of this section see Caland's introduction to JGS. and our notes to the translation. The first paragraph of 1, 49 is not commented upon because the custom of the *anustaraṇī* had gone out of use in the time of the commentator: *ita ūrdhvam samstaranīm nāma gām hatvā tasyās tat tad aṅgāni paretasya tat tad aṅgeṣu vinyasanādīvidhiḥ kalāv anupayuktatvān na vyākhyātaḥ*. Then he continues with *āsye hiranyaśakalam ādāya* (r. *ādhyā*; this sentence is found in JGS. ed. 2, 4: 30. 3) *upari kṣāsthāni samstīrya yathāsthitam agnīm prohya upadīpayanti* (apparently a combination of JGS. ed. 2, 4: 30. 3 f. *agnīm upohya* and JB. 1, 49 *saṃstīryopadīpayanti*). Since *upari kṣāsthāni* is missing in JB. as well as JGS., one may assume that Śrinivāsa has used a text of JB. which reads *upari kṣāsthāni saṃstīrya* and that our mss. contain a gap before *saṃstīrya* (which in that case would not refer to the *anustaraṇī* ritual; but remarkably enough the Subodhini speaks of a *saṃstaranī* instead of an *anustaraṇī* cow). After *upadīpayanti* the text of the commentary continues (in accordance with JB. 1, 49) *sa tathaiḥ cikīrṣed yathainam āhavanīyaḥ prathamam gacchet tathainam* (JB. *tad enam*) *devalokaḥ pratyāgacchati*. The commentary on JB. 1, 49 here stops. The phrases *atha yathānvāhāryapacanas* . . etc., which form a problem in JB. and may

represent later additions, are left out. This *āhitāgnidahanapaṭalaḥ* is concluded with the end of JGS. 2, 4.

In the next *paṭala* Śrīnivāsa again takes up the text of JGS. ed. 2, 4: 29. 17 ff. *sati śarīram* *luptakeśam* *nikṛttanakham* *citām āropayanti* (JGS. ed. *satīśarīram* *uptakeśa* ..). The commentary interprets *satīśarīram* (r. *sati śarīra*) as "the body of the good wife": *satīśarīram* *pativratāśarīram* *ity arthaḥ*. *upariṣṭādvakṣyamānanirmanthyena dahanam* (see JGS. ed. 2, 5: 30. 7 *āhitāgneś cet pūrvam jāyā mriyeta tām nirmanthyena dahet*) *tu apativratāyā iti gamyate*. This is not only completely incorrect, it also contradicts the commentator's earlier view that *sati śarīra* should be read (which refers to the *anaṣṭaśarīra*; see above). Is Śrīnivāsa not to be blamed for this stupid contradiction and can we assume that a second hand was at work in this commentary?

The sūtra belongs to a considerably later period than the present section inserted in JB. This appears from the fact that its description of the funeral rites (starting with *sati śarīra* ..) refers to JB. in order to avoid a double treatment. It explicitly condemns some obsolete customs (e.g. the disemboweling) by giving its own, summarized version of the JB. passage in which the details criticized are omitted: *sati śarīra* *uptakeśam* (JB. *vapanti keśaśmaśrūṇi*) *nikṛttanakham* (JB. *nakhān nikṛntanti*) [JB. *nirāntram kṛtvā niṣpuriṣam kurvanti* is left out] *prakṣālitam* (omitted in Śrīnivāsa's text; it does not have an equivalent in JB. as *prakṣālya* there is associated with *āntrāṇi*) *citām āropayanti* (JB. 1, 48). The offering of liquid butter in JB. 1, 47 is omitted here, but the sūtra later refers to it. The commentator who inserted the JB. section for the funeral of the *āhitāgni* was left with a simpler, younger and abridged version of the sūtra (with references to the old JB. treatment of this ritual). In his opinion this abridgement only dealt with the funeral of the *āhitāgni*'s *pativratā* (*sati*) wife, for whom the disemboweling should not be allowed: *tasyāyaṃ purastād apavādaḥ nirāntrakaraṇaniṣpuriṣa-karaṇāhutiṇām nivṛttyarthaś ca. anyat sarvaṃ āhitāgnivad eva*. The sūtra continues *atra pātrāṇy api cinoti* "tasyām enam ādadhati tasya nāsikayoḥ srūvaṃ nidadhyād" *ity etenānuvākena*, i.e. it refers to JB. 1, 48 (a chapter which does not contain obsolete practices) in order to abridge its description of the *āhitāgni*'s funeral ceremony. The commentator, however, has it refer to the *āhitāgni*'s wife (a rather odd interpretation especially in view of the *pātracayana*): *atra satīśarīradahane "tasyām" ityādyanu-vākaḥ hitam yajñapātranidhānam api āhitāgnivad eva kuryād ity arthaḥ*. Then the sūtra again quotes JB.: *ya evamvit syāt sa yadopatāpī syād iti pūrvam eva caturgrhitam grhitvānyam* (r. *anyad*) *yathāsambhavam*. The commentator evidently has not understood this passage (due to his misinterpretation of *satīśarīram*) and places a stop after *pūrvam eva*. The anuvāka *sa yadopatāpī syād* would only refer to transferring the fires in case of expected death and represent an obsolete practice (*pūrvam*): *sa yadopatāpī syād* (remarkably enough *ya evamvit syāt* is rightly omitted) *ityādinaṃ pūrvoktaḥ jīvata eva śmaśānapraveśavidhiḥ pūrvam eva kṛtādiyugeṣv eva nādhunā prakṛtais tathā kartum śakyam ity arthaḥ*. The commentator seems to overlook that this funeral deals with the *āhitāgni*'s

wife in his own (wrong) view and that in the description of the *āhitāgni*'s funeral (inserted from JB.) this custom was mentioned without disapproval. Obviously *pūrvam* should be taken with *caturgrhitam grhitvā*, the action which takes place before the *pātracayana* and for which the sūtra refers to JB. The reference starts with the beginning of this section (by mistake even including the last three words of the preceding section: *ya evamvit syāt*) and not with 1, 47, which forms a separate chapter only in the present redaction. The sūtra makes the other prescriptions of JB. 1, 46-47 optional (*anyad yathāsambhavam*; with the exception of those details such as the shaving of the corpse which have already been treated in the sūtra). Only the offering of butter seems to be compulsory. The commentary interprets *anyam* as *āhitāgnitaram aupāsānāgnimantam samidādhānāgnimantam vā*. The rest of JGS. 2, 4 was already commented upon at the end of the JB. insertion. The Subodhini now continues with JGS. 2, 5 and has no more interest for us.

So one may conclude that JGS. is much younger than the JB. section on the funeral rites (some customs are rejected) and that the sūtra-like passage in JB. already formed a part of the text when JGS. was composed (JB. is quoted *ya evamvit syāt sa yadopatāpī syāt*). The commentary is mediocre (to put it mildly) and may in this section have been written by more than one hand since it contains a serious contradiction and the composition is confused. The commentator who misinterpreted the passage starting with *sati śarīra* (*satīśarīram*) must also have inserted the present JB. section in the commentary (otherwise there would be no funeral ritual for the *āhitāgni* in his commentary). The same man may have been responsible for the transposition of JGS. 2, 4 to the end of the commentary (where he could freely make his elaborate insertion).

The position of this comparatively old sūtra-like section in JB. and its origin remain obscure. Oertel, o.c., p. 103 unconvincingly tries to explain it in the context of the brāhmaṇa: "As in ŚB. the funeral rites are incidentally dealt with in the JB. in connection with a possible mortal illness of the sacrificer, his death being considered as one of many disturbances of the sacrifice which call for an expiation (*prāyaścitti*)". This explanation, which only holds good partially in the case of ŚB., does not make sense as far as JB. is concerned. This section obviously is an insertion and its source seems to have been a sūtra. This sūtra may have been a Śāṭyāyana. See Oertel, o.c., p. 106, who rightly observes that quotations from a Śāṭyāyanakam may refer to a sūtra rather than to a brāhmaṇa. On the other hand a sūtra-like quotation from the Śāṭyāyanakam which concerns the funeral ritual is not found in the present JB. section (see Oertel). Perhaps JB. has taken this section with some modifications and abridgements from a lost Śāṭ. sūtra without being entirely identical to that text.

On ritualistic details and their parallels see the notes, which contain many references to Caland's *Bestattungsgebräuche*. Here it may be useful to treat at some length two starting-points for a comparison of the texts which deal with these rites, i.e. the mantras *ayam vai tvad* .. etc. (1, 47)

and the piling of the implements on the corpse (I, 48). On the rite in which these mantras are recited in JB. see n. 12, where it is shown that JB. combines two different ritual actions and that in the parallel texts these mantras are used at the cremation proper and its accompanying āhutis.

In the schematic arrangement of the mantras which is given below the following parallels of JB. (I, 47) figure: TĀ.¹ (6, 1, 4; = BPiS. 1, 8; 13, 3); TĀ.² (6, 2, 1; = VS. 35, 22; SB. 12, 5, 2, 15; KŚS. 25, 7, 38; GPiS. 1, 3, 13 and 2, 7, 36 reading *tasmāt* instead of *asmāt*); TĀ.³ (6, 4, 2; = BPiS. 1, 13 and 3, 5); ŚŚS. (4, 14, 36); ĀsvGS. (4, 3, 27; = KauśS. 81, 30). TĀ.¹ is recited after the *upoṣaṇa* (Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 62), whereas ŚŚS. accompanies the kindling of the pyre. On *asmāt tvam adhi* . . and the offering with which it is connected see Caland, o.c., p. 63, whose remark "In allen sūtras [i.e. except the Taitt.] geht die spende dem upoṣaṇam voran" is not correct. According to SB., KŚS. and GPiS. (2, 7, 36; reading *tasmāt*, but for the rest following SB., as also appears from the context) the offering takes place after the *upoṣaṇa*. See also GPiS. 1, 3, 19 *dahanamantrena* (referring to 1, 3, 13) *ājyāhutim hutvā* (after the *upoṣaṇa*). The Taitt. use this mantra at the cremation (BPiS. 1, 13; 3, 10, followed by ĀgnGS. and later ritualists) or incidentally (BPiS. 3, 5). These formulas are always connected with the cremation regarded as an offering to Agni. See also JB. I, 2. They are never recited before the *pātracayana* as in this instance. JB. seems to represent a combination of two sacrifices; the offering at home (with different mantras) and the offering at the *śmaśāna* (using these mantras, but performed at the very moment of cremation). See n. 12.

JB.	<i>ayaṃ vai tvad asmād asi tvam etad</i> / (II)
TĀ. ¹	<i>ayaṃ vai tvam asmād adhi tvam etad</i> / (II)
ŚŚS.	<i>ayaṃ vai tvat t(u)vam asmād</i> / (8)
JB.	<i>ayaṃ te yonir asya yonis t(u)vam</i> // (II)
TĀ. ¹	<i>ayaṃ vai tad asya yonir asi</i> // (IO) [vaiśvānarah]
ŚŚS.	<i>ayaṃ te yonis t(u)vam asya yonih</i> // (II)
JB.	<i>pitrā putrāya lokakṛj jātavedo</i> / (12)
TĀ. ¹	<i>putrah pitre lokakṛj jātavedo</i> / (II)
ŚŚS.	[jātavedo]
JB.	<i>nayā hy (hi) enam sukr̥tām yatra lokāḥ</i> // (12)
TĀ. ¹	<i>vahemaṃ (vaha imam) sukr̥tām yatra lokāḥ</i> // (II)
ŚŚS.	<i>vahasvainaṃ sukr̥tām yatra lokāḥ</i> // (II)
JB.	<i>asmād vai tvam ajāyathā eṣa tvaj jāyatām svāhā</i> //
ĀsvGS.	<i>asmād vai tvam ajāyathā ayaṃ tvad adhi jāyatām</i> //
TĀ. ²	<i>asmāt tvam adhi jāto 'si tvad ayaṃ jāyatām punaḥ</i> //
TĀ. ³	<i>asmāt tvam adhi jāto 'si ayaṃ tvad adhi jāyatām</i> //
ŚŚS.	<i>ayaṃ vai tvām ajanayad ayaṃ tvad adhi jāyatām</i> //

Conclusions:

a) Oertel's division of the first two pādas, followed by Raghu Vira and Lokesh Chandra (see also their "Studies in the JB."), is not correct. The

metre consists of four pādas of eleven or twelve syllables (*triṣṭubh/jagati*) and two pādas of eight syllables. By pronouncing *tvad* and *tvam* in the first, and *tvam* in the second pāda one may obtain two pādas of 11 respectively 12 syllables in Oertel's division. The corrupt TĀ. parallel, however, does not allow this punctuation since *vai* is scarcely possible in third position. See also the mantras recited at the agnyādhāna TB. 1, 2, 1, 20 *aham tvad asmi mad asi tvam etad* / (II) *mamāsi yonis tava yonir asmi* / (II) *mamaiva san vaha havyāny* (= i) *agne* / (II) *putrah pitre lokakṛj jātavedaḥ* // (II). Cf. TB. 2, 5, 8, 7; 3, 7, 7, 10; ĀpŚS. 5, 16, 1 (a.o.). In these mantras *etad* cannot but be taken with the first pāda. Its meaning is quite clear there. The mantra is recited just after the establishment of the fire and *etad* consequently means "now" or "here". See Caland's translation of ĀpŚS. 5, 16, 1 " . . du bist hier aus mir (hervorgekommen)". The verse is also recited in other rites where the relationship of sacrificer and fire plays a role. In the present funeral mantras — probably adaptations of the agnyādhāna mantras — *etad* is rather superfluous and therefore has been omitted by ŚŚS. Oertel as well as Śrīnivāsa do not understand *etad* in this context and explain it as a causal adverb: *asmād āhitāgneḥ pituh aranyāḥ patnyās tvam prādurbhūto 'si yataḥ tataḥ ayaṃ te yonih* . . (Oertel translates the mantra: "He verily is of thee, of him thou art; thus he is thy womb . .").

b) In the *triṣṭubh* pādas JB. and TĀ. are, in general, similar, but in some points the parallelism with ŚŚS. is more striking. TĀ.¹ contains some corruptions. Presumably the original reading of TĀ. was also *ayaṃ te yonih* (cf. RV. 3, 29, 10 *ayaṃ te yonir r̥viyo* . . ; again influence from the agnyādhāna) which with *asya yonir asi* forms a *triṣṭubh* pāda rather than *ayaṃ vai tad* (r. *tvad*) which should be transferred to the first pāda (for *ayaṃ vai tvam*; see also Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 63, n. 237).

c) Together the third and fourth pāda of TĀ.¹ amount to 25 syllables. In the *triṣṭubh* scheme *vaiśvānarah* is superfluous as appears from TB. 1, 2, 1, 20 *putrah pitre lokakṛj jātavedas* (11 syllables). Probably the fourth pāda (unless *vaha imam* is pronounced) is short of one or two syllables because it has been taken from the preceding mantra, . . / *yās te śivās tanuvo jātaveda* / *tābhīr vahemaṃ sukr̥tām yatra lokāḥ* //, in which the metre is faultless. Or has the original reading been *vahāsy enam*? Cf. TB. 3, 7, 6, 9; ĀpŚS. 4, 7, 2 *vahāsi mā sukr̥tām yatra lokāḥ* (II) (= KS. 31, 14 *vahāṃsi sā sukr̥tām* . . ; see Bloomfield-Edgerton, *Vedic Variants* II, p. 156 and 407). In that case *nayāhy* (to be read *nayā hy* according to "Studies in the JB." — a corruption of *nayāsy* (*Vedic Variants* II, p. 153 and 375) — may be a variant of *vahāsy*. If the reading of the critical edition is retained, *nayā* with lengthened *a* would imply that this mantra is old. For *hi* with imperative see Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 522; for the lengthening before two consonants of which the second is *y* or *v* see Wackernagel-Debrunner, *Altind. Grammatik* I, p. 311. At any rate the JB. mantra cannot be derived from the transmitted TĀ.¹ version, which seems to consist of three pādas of 11 syllables (after correction of the second; the third starts with *vaiśvānarah*) and two of 8 syllables:

jātavedo vaha imam | sukr̥taam yatra lokāḥ ||. The four pādas of 11/12 syllables in JB. seem to be more original. They may even have been present in the TĀ. version (as appears from the outline). One may assume that *pitā putrāya* forms an adaptation of *putrah pitre* (TB. 1, 2, 1, 20) and that JB. has taken these recasted agnyādhāna mantras from a Taittirīya source.

d) By omitting some words ŚSS. has disturbed the 11/12 syllabic composition of the first pādas. The dropping of *etad* (see above) turned the first pāda into an 8 syllabic one. The second pāda could not be changed into an 8 syllabic one without detracting from the contents (the break and cadence *t(u)vam asya yoniḥ* even looks more regular than in the other versions); the third pāda was omitted, the fourth changed into two 8 syllabic ones by taking *jātavedo* with *vahemam*, which was replaced by *vahasvainam* for metrical reasons: *jātavedo vahasvainam | sukr̥tām (= aam) yatra lokāḥ*.

e) JB. and ŚSS. have connected the mantras *ayam vai tvad* .. and *asmāt tvam adhi* (or its variants) .., which were used by different schools or on different occasions. Both texts have the correct readings *ayam vai tvad* and *ayam te yoniḥ* and read *lokāḥ* (instead of TĀ. *lokāḥ*). The version of ŚSS. which is in many respects secondary may be (at least partly) based on JB.

f) In the second (8 syllabic) mantra several variants occur. See *Vedic Variants*, passim. The JB. version of the second pāda in which *svāhā* has to be counted as part of the 8 syllabic pāda (replacing *adhi* or *punaḥ*) does not seem to be original.

Śrīnivāsa comments on the mantras as follows: *he agne ayam vai tvat ayam āhitāgniḥ tvat tvatsakāśād vai prādurbhūtaḥ agner āpaḥ adbhyaḥ prthivī pūrvyā* (r. *prthivyāḥ*) *osadhayaḥ osadhībhya annam annāt puruṣa iti śrūyate asmād āhitāgneḥ pituḥ aranyāḥ patnyās tvam prādurbhūto 'si yataḥ tataḥ ayam te yoniḥ ca tvam iti yuvām pitāputrau he jātavedaḥ pitā putre* (r. *pitre*) *putrāya putrah iti prathamācaturthyor vyatyayaḥ yatra sukr̥tām lokāḥ tatrainam nayāhi naya asmād vai ajāyathāḥ iyaṃtām kalam asya gr̥he etad(a) dattāyajahavissomādibhir avaradhayathāḥ tathā eṣa tvatsakāśāt jāyatām yajñabhujām anyatamo bhūtvā yajñabhāgāmṛtabrahmānāndādibhir vardhatām* (the whole text is reproduced as found in Caland's transcript). First it may be observed that commenting on verses is rather unusual. It may indicate that this commentary is rather young and not one of the most outstanding. The latter fact seems to be confirmed by its explanation of the mantras. The water doctrine (on which see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. VI B; for the present version compare TU. 2, 1) evidently does not form the correct explanation of *ayam vai tvad*. The sacrificer or rather his life (breath) is produced out of the fire in accordance with the agnyādhāna theory of JB. 1, 1. The fires are his *prāṇāḥ*. Consequently one can say that he is produced by (or dependent on) the fire which he has actually produced himself. The father is his own son. Therefore *putrah pitre* is equal to *pitā putrāya*. The commentator tries to interpret the second mantra (*asmād vai tvam* ..) — a remote variant of the first — as different from the first.

For the piling of the sacrificial implements (*pātracayanam*) see Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 49 ff. and the tables drawn up by Oertel, o.c., p. 107 ff., which show some similarities and differences between the parallels without elucidating the relation between the texts. The only conclusion drawn by Oertel (p. 111) that "the differences between the JB and the younger Sāmant texts are noteworthy", is rather meagre for an outline covering four printed pages. From a methodological point of view his survey is not satisfactory since it draws the attention only to incidental (and consequently perhaps accidental) similarities, but not to the agreements of *pātracayanam* as a totality. A ritualistic school does not borrow the placing of a single, particular implement on a particular part of the body, but adopts (or is influenced by) the complete *pātracayanam* of another school. Moreover the one school seems to be influenced by a (passage from a) text (written or orally transmitted) of another school, rather than by the actual observance of particular customs and ritualistic details. This form of borrowing involves the risk of making rather automatic mistakes. Therefore the order of the arrangement of the implements, the order of the parts of the body, the number of the implements, etc. should be marked in order to give an impression of the similarities between complete *pātracayanam* passages. The outline drawn up below includes the most important passages: JB. (1, 48); LSS. (8, 8, 17 ff.; cf. DSS. 23, 4, 16 ff. and GPiS. 2, 7, 12 ff.); ŚB. (12, 5, 2, 17; cf. KSS. 25, 7, 21 ff.); ŚSS. (4, 14, 18 ff.); ĀsvGS. (4, 3, 2 ff.); KauśS. (81, 4 ff.); BPiS. (1, 5 f.). The secondary BPiS., the younger Taitt., VaiGS., ĀgnGS. and MSS. will be discussed later. The implements are left untranslated. By *camasaḥ* and *pātri* the several implements placed on (or at) the head and on the abdomen are denoted: *samoṣṭadhānaḥ camasaḥ* (LSS.); *samavattadhānaḥ camasaḥ* (ĀsvGS., on the abdomen, but according to GPiS. on the head!); *pranīṭa-pranayanah camasaḥ* (ŚB.; BPiS.; on left ear ŚSS.); *camasaḥ ilopahavanah* (*ilopavahanam* as read by Oertel and the crit. ed. is wrong; see Caland, JGS. ed., p. 10) (JB.); *idācamasaḥ* (KauśS.); *pātri* (LSS.; ĀsvGS.; KauśS.); *pātri samavattadhāni* (JB.; ŚB.; *saṃvartadhāni* in JB. crit. ed. has to be emended; the correct reading in Oertel's edition); *samavattadhāni* (ŚSS.); *dārupātri* (BPiS.). The *puroḍāśam* placed on the chest in KauśS. seems to be the *puroḍāśapātri* (Caland, o.c., p. 50) and can be explained as a *pātri* in our outline. This outline is mainly based on the arrangement of ŚB., which is followed by most texts and which may represent one of the oldest *pātracayanam*s.

Implements	JB	LSS	ŚB	ŚSS	ĀsvGS	KauśS	BPiS	Parts of body
<i>juhū</i>	2	5	1	1	1	1	8	Right hand
<i>upabhr̥t</i>	3	6	2	2	2	2	9	Left hand
<i>dhruvā</i>	4	7	3	3	5	3	10	Chest
								(KauśS Throat)
<i>agnihotrava-</i> <i>vanī</i>	5	4	4	4	4	4	1	Mouth (ŚSS Throat; ĀsvGS Left side)

Implements	JB	LŚS	ŚB	ŚŚS	ĀśvGS	KauśS	BPiS	Parts of body
<i>sruvaḥ</i> (-au)	1	3	5	5	8	5	2	Nostrils
<i>prāśitraharaṇam</i> (-e)	7	2	6	6	9	6	4	Ears (ŚŚS Right ear; LŚS, KauśS Fore- head)
<i>camasaḥ</i>	6	1	7	7	10	7	7	Head (ŚŚS Left ear; ĀśvGS Abdomen)
<i>kapalāni</i>	—	1	—	8	6	—	5	Head
<i>grāvāṇaḥ</i>	—	—	—	9	7	—	—	Teeth
<i>pātrī</i>	8	8	9	10	10	11/8	14	Abdomen (KauśS 8 Chest)
<i>dr̥ṣadupale</i>	9	10	—	—	—	—	21	Scrotum (LŚS Between thighs)
<i>śamyā</i>	10	10	10	—	11	—	22	Penis (ĀśvGS Pudenda; LŚS Between thighs)
<i>vṛṣāravaḥ</i> (-au)	—	—	11	—	—	—	22	Penis / Scrotum (BPiS / ŚB)
<i>kṛṣṇājīnam</i>	11	9	—	13	—	—	—	Pudenda (ŚŚS Left side)
<i>araṇī</i>	—	—	—	14	12	—	10	Pudenda (ĀśvGS Loins; BPiS Chest)
<i>sphyaḥ</i>	12	—	12	12	3	9	13	Back (ŚŚS, ĀśvGS, KauśS Right side; ŚB Right hand)
<i>upaveśaḥ</i>	—	—	—	—	—	10	—	Left side
<i>musalam</i> (-e)	13	12	—	—	—	—	—	Both sides / Along thighs (JB / LŚS)
<i>ulūkhalam</i>	14	11	—	—	—	—	—	Feet / To the right of the right upper leg (JB / LŚS)
<i>ulūkhalamū- sale</i>	—	—	11	15	13	12	20	Loins / Knees / Lower legs / Scrotum (ŚŚS, BPiS / ŚŚS, KauśS / ĀśvGS/ ŚB)
<i>śūrpam</i> (-e)	13	13	8	—	14	14	15	Both sides / Feet (JB, ŚB, BPiS / LŚS, ĀśvGS, KauśS)
<i>śūrpasakaṭe</i>	—	—	—	16	—	—	—	Feet
<i>śakatam</i>	—	—	—	—	—	13	—	Hips

Conclusions:

a) The corpse is covered from the head to the feet. LŚS. and BPiS. start with the head and its openings, whereas in the other texts the hands and the chest come first. JB. seems to have disturbed the regular order by starting with the nostrils (more or less in accordance with LŚS.) and thereafter shifting to the order of the other texts. LŚS. has reversed the usual order mouth, nostrils, ears (forehead), (top of the) head. It is remarkable that the teeth, only occurring in ŚŚS. and ĀśvGS., are mentioned after the head in both texts which have a rather different order in the remaining items. The position of the teeth (corresponding to the mouth of the other texts) in ĀśvGS., where the (top of the) head precedes the openings of the head, seems to be more original. The order of JB. 6 and 7 (head and ears, one of the openings of the head) may be secondary. The other texts make the orifices precede the (top of the) head. Influence from LŚS.?

b) Not only the order of the parts of the body is rather uniform, but also the order of the implements. Sometimes the implements retain the original order, whereas the parts of the body change place. KauśS., for instance, places the *dhruvā* in its usual 3d position on the throat instead of the chest. Now this chest in position 8 receives a *pātrī* (*puroḍāśam* = *puroḍāśapātrī*) — the usual 8th item of the implements (JB.; LŚS.; 10th in ŚŚS. and ĀśvGS., where, however, it would be 8th without the later additions and transpositions). ŚŚS. retains *agnihotrahavanī* as 4th, but places it on the throat instead of the mouth, which is left out and secondarily replaced by the teeth (9). ĀśvGS. puts the same spoon on the left side. It is striking that the two sides, moved from the 12th and 13th place [thus in ŚŚS.; in KauśS. they are 9th and 10th], have retained for the right one the *sphyaḥ* (JB. and ŚB. 12; BPiS. 13); for the left side the order of the implements prevailed and the *agnihotrahavanī* (4th in most parallels) was laid down on the 4th position. Several other instances may be given where we find that the utensils preserve the original order whereas their position on the corpse changed. Most of them can be read from the table. Observe that ŚŚS. *prāṇitāpranayanāḥ* (sc. *camasaḥ*) on the left ear (7) corresponds to *camasaḥ* *prāṇitāpranayaḥ* (respectively *pran. cam.*) on (at) the head in ŚB. and BPiS. in 7th position (in spite of the fact that the latter text, at many points, has a different order of distribution). Compare also KauśS. *idācamasaḥ* (7). ĀśvGS. also does not place the *camasaḥ* (i.e. *samavattadhānaḥ*) on the head (but on the abdomen). It retains, however, the fixed order *sruvaḥ*, *prāśitraharaṇam*, *camasaḥ*. Perhaps ĀśvGS. *pātrīm samavattadhānaṃ ca camasaṃ* (10) represents a combination of *pātrīm* (LŚS.; cf. ŚB., JB. *pātrīm samavattadhānim*), the original implement on the abdomen, and *samavattadhānaṃ camasaṃ* (DŚS.; cf. LŚS. *samoptadhānaṃ ca camasaṃ*), the implement following (or preceding) *prāśitraharaṇam* in the parallels.

c) Most of the differences can be explained as later developments due to rearrangement or insertion of new items. Often these developments are traceable because the order of the piling of the implements was fre-

quently left unchanged. One common source, not necessarily to be found among the transmitted texts, is probable. One of the oldest pātracayanās is found in ŚB. Like several sūtras JB. (i.e. this sūtra-like insertion) seems to follow this brāhmaṇa. The first seven items agree almost completely (except for the transpositions 5/1 and 7/6, which may be due to LŚS.). ŚB. 8 *śūrpe* (on both sides, as in JB.) was transferred to the 13th position in JB., undoubtedly under influence of LŚS., where the *śūrpam* is laid at or on the feet and consequently the 13th and last position is quite normal. JB. 8 now corresponds to ŚB. 9; JB. 9 has been taken from LŚS.; JB. 10 again corresponds to ŚB. 10 (and to some extent to LŚS. 10); JB. 11 has no relation to ŚB., but agrees with LŚS.; JB. 12 more or less corresponds to ŚB. 12; JB. 13 and 14 come from LŚS. One may conclude that the JB. *pātracayanam* derives from ŚB., but was rearranged under influence of the Sāmavedic sūtra LŚS. Consequently Oertel's conclusion (o.c., p. 111) that the "differences between the JB. and the other younger Sāmantexts are noteworthy" has to be corrected. First the similarities are noteworthy as well, as appears from the outline, in which they become more evident than in his own survey. Secondly Oertel's expression "younger Sāmantexts" seems to be only partially correct. GPiS. (here almost identical to DŚS.) is undoubtedly late (Caland, *Pitṛmedhasūtras*, p. XXII). DŚS. has been proved to be an adaptation of LŚS. by A. Parpola, *The Śrautasūtras of Lāṭyāyana and Drāhyāyana and their commentaries*, I: 1 (thesis Helsinki 1968), p. 33 ff., who also demonstrates that DŚS. and the Rāṇāyānīya school have been influenced by JB. and the Jaiminīyas (o.c., p. 41). LŚS. is younger than JŚS. (o.c., p. 95 f.; cf. also Parpola, "On the Jaiminīyaśrautasūtra and Its Annexes", *Orientalia Suecana* 16, 1967, p. 201 f.) and has drawn from JB. (o.c., p. 91; Caland, "Over en uit het JB.", o.c., p. 41 ff.). Are we, however, to assume that the whole JB. is older than LŚS.? The brāhmaṇa by no means should be regarded as a complete unity. The agnihotra section (1, 1-65) seems to form a later addition and the sūtra-like passage on the funeral ritual looks like an insertion in that (late) section. So it may be assumed that the *pātracayanam* of JB. was influenced by LŚS. With regard to the most striking proof of this assumption, the position of *śūrpe* (see above), one may observe that "On both sides" (the place where the *śūrpe* are laid according to JB. and ŚB., but which is not mentioned in the *pātracayanam* of LŚS.) was inserted in DŚS. and GPiS. in 7th position. Obviously *pārśvayoh sphoyopaveṣau* is an insertion since it separates *tathā vrkyaṇ* (LŚS. *vrkkau*) *yathāsvam* [incorrectly translated by *Śrautakośa* I, p. 1081 which does not mention the kidneys] from *dakṣiṇe* and *save pāṇau*, the two spots on which the kidneys should be placed according to all the parallel texts. At one point JB. disagrees with ŚB. as well as with LŚS. The remaining implements are laid *upari*, in all other texts between the thighs. Instead of *pariśiṣṭāni* (JB.) or *anyāni* (ŚB.) *pātrāni* LŚS. has *yac ca nādeksyāmaḥ*. Caland's note on GPiS. 2, 7, 26, in which he regards the correction *adikṣāma* as obvious and rejects the possibility of a future tense, is untenable. The future *ādeksyāmaḥ* (see also *The Pitṛmedhasūtras*, Appendix, p. 132) is undoubtedly correct

since "between the thighs" does not (as in the parallel passages) form the conclusion of the piling in LŚS.

d) On the other texts and their interrelationship some short remarks. The R̥gvedic sūtras ŚŚS. and ĀśvGS., which agree with each other in many respects, seem to be based on ŚB. There are some agreements with LŚS. and DŚS. (*pātri*; *samavattadhānaḥ camasaḥ*; *kapalāni*; *śūrpam*, *śakaṭasūrpe*). Has ŚŚS. (4, 5, 6, 7, 8) borrowed from LŚS. (4, 3, 2, 1, 1)? Perhaps the R̥gvedic sūtras could shift the *camasaḥ* to another position by introducing the *kapalāni* on the head. On the relation between ŚŚS. and ĀśvGS. V. M. Apte, *Non-R̥gvedic Mantras rubricated in the Āśvalāyana-Gṛhyasūtra* (= *N.I.A.* 3, 1940-41), p. 60 observes that the ĀśvGS. passage is based on ŚŚS. On the one hand the position of the teeth in ĀśvGS. (before the nostrils and ears and therefore replacing the mouth) seems to be more original than in ŚŚS., where "teeth" after "head" is odd. On the other hand ĀśvGS. "left side" (4) betrays a rather careless transposition and ŚŚS., as a totality makes a more original impression (i.e. it is closer to the ŚB. original). Perhaps later on the older ŚŚS. adopted some items such as the *grāvāmaḥ* on the teeth from ĀśvGS. A considerable extension of this piling is to be seen in BPiS., which may be younger than the parallels of the outline. On the whole it follows ŚB., but some striking similarities with JB. (*sphyah*; *dr̥ṣadupale*) may be noticed. KauS. agrees with ŚŚS. in some items; the inclusion of "throat" (third instead of fourth); *ulūkhalamusale*; *sphyah*; *śakaṭam* (cf. ŚŚS. *śūrpaśakaṭe*); *śūrpaśakaṭe* placed on or at the feet (whereas KauS. places only the *śūrpam* there). Has ŚŚS. 16 combined KauS. 13 and 14? KauS. also agrees with LŚS. / DŚS.: *prāṣitraharaṇam*; *pātri*; *upaveṣah* (DŚS. *sphyopaveṣau* "on both sides"); *śakaṭam* (DŚS. *śakaṭasūrpe*). At least the youngest of the two Sāmavedic sūtras seems to be influenced by KauS. (especially in the case of the *sphyopaveṣau*, where DŚS. differs from LŚS.). Unfortunately the texts of the Kaṭhas concerning the *pātracayanam* seem to be incomplete (Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 53, n. 192). In the *grhyapañcikā* ms. B¹ fol. 114 a ff., to which Caland refers in *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. IX, a very short *cayanam* (apparently independent from ŚB.) is given in which the *dr̥ṣadau* are placed at the scrotum (cf. JB. *dr̥ṣadupale*), the *ulūkhalamusale* on the penis, the *kapalāni* and the *upayāmaḥ* on or at the head.

There are other texts dealing with the *pātracayanam* such as the secondary BPiS. and the younger Taittirīyas which have not been included in the table above. Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. IV f. observes on this secondary BPiS. (i.e. BPiS. 2-3): "... weicht dieser kalpa merkwürdigerweise in einem einzelfalle vom älteren Baudhāyana ab und schliesst sich den jüngeren Taittirīyaschulen an, nämlich bei der schichtung der opfergeräte". Miss Raabe, o.c., p. XVII points at the similarity of BPiS. 3, 3 and HirPiS. 1, 5 f., but only enumerates the differences without explaining the relation between the two passages. As to the "secondary" BPiS. as a totality she hesitatingly draws the conclusion that perhaps it may be even older than HirPiS. (p. XIX). The relationship can be

established with much more accuracy if, for example, corresponding passages such as the *pātracayanam* are compared in a more systematic way. Referring for brevity's sake to the above table I shall mention only the significant points. The most important one is the placement of the *ulūkhālamusale* on the thighs in BPiS.¹ (20) and BPiS.² (8); on the jaws in HirPiS. (8). In the order of distribution "thighs" (8) between "ears" (7) and "teeth" (9) is obviously out of place in BPiS.² The only possible explanation is that HirPiS., or rather its source BhārPiS., has introduced the jaws in this piling and has placed the *ulūkhālamusale* on these jaws, which required two implements and, moreover, resemble the mortar and pestle because of their function (the two sets of eating teeth; in their original position the two implements had a function in sexual symbolism). BPiS.² adopting the piling of BhārPiS. (or the identical HirPiS. and ĀpPiS.), but still under influence of BPiS.¹, corrected *ulūkhālamusale* "jaws" into *ulūkhālamusale* "thighs" without changing the order. One can even guess why BhārPiS. has introduced the jaws. They had to facilitate the insertion of the teeth, not mentioned by BPiS.¹ and taken from ĀśvGS. / ŚSS. In those Rgvedic sūtras the teeth formed the substitute of "mouth". In BhārPiS., which has retained "mouth" (4), "teeth" is superfluous in the series of orifices of the head and had to be set apart by means of "jaws". The general impression created by BhārPiS. is that of a remodeling of BPiS.¹ in which some pilings have been left out and others added. BPiS.², however, seems to have added some items to the *pātracayanam* of BhārPiS., but to have followed BPiS.¹ more closely. BhārPiS. starts the piling with the right hand etc. in accordance with most texts of the table. BPiS.¹ dealing with the piling in two chapters (5 and 6) ends ch. 5 shortly after the beginning of the *cayanam* with a pratika (*imam agne camasam*) and opens the next chapter with the full quotation (cf. the end of ch. 1; 4; 6; 8; 11; 15). BhārPiS. also makes an incision in the *pātracayanam* passage (after *dhruvām arañī ca*), but neither the contents nor the occurrence of a quotation give rise to the beginning of a new chapter. The order of the piling and the changes brought about in this order by the Taittirīyas form the criterion. BPiS.¹ differs from the other, older passages dealing with the *cayanam* in starting its piling with the mouth (4th in the parallels of the outline). The usual first item, the *juhū* on the right hand, now occupies the 8th position, but strangely enough opens a new chapter (after the full quotation belonging to the pratika of the preceding chapter). BhārPiS. on the other hand begins with the right hand, but starts a new chapter with the placing of the *agnihotrahanavānī* on the mouth, i.e. the opening of the *pātracayanam* in BPiS.¹ So BhārPiS. has directly taken its *pātracayanam* from BPiS.¹ and adapted its order to the usual one. BPiS.² just as BPiS.¹ begins with the mouth instead of the right hand, but does not start a new chapter with the right hand. The pratika *imam agne camasam* here concludes the chapter as well as the whole piling (except for some prescriptions on the rest of the implements). This transference to the end of the *cayanam* (where the next chapter, as usual in Baudhāyana, starts with the full quotation) is undoubtedly adopted

from BhārPiS., where the pratika occurs in the same position. BhārPiS. (21/22) has combined BPiS.¹ *śirastāḥ pranītāpranayanam camasam nidadhātīmam agne camasam* (7) with *śirasta upasādanīyam kūrcaṁ nidadhātī* (23) in *śirasta upasādanīyam idāpātram cemam agne camasam iti madhye camasam*. For *idāpātram* compare JB. *ilopahavanah* (6) and KauśS. *idācamasaḥ* (7) similarly placed on or at the head. It is doubtful if *madhye* means "on the waist" as Oertel, o.c., p. 108 translates it. See Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 53, n. 200 quoting Gopālayajvan's *pitṛmedhasūtrabhāṣya*: *camaso 'tra pranītāpranayanam śiraso madhye etayarcā nidadhātī*. See also Caland's translation of ĀpSS. 31, 2, 21: "...mitten (auf das Haupt)". On the other hand "at the feet", "at the head" and "in/on the middle" (Kashikar translates BhārPiS. 1, 6, 19 "in the middle") form an excellent, systematical conclusion of the piling. BPiS.² (ed. Raabe) reads *śirasta upasādanīyam vedam śikhāyām idāpātram ca pranītāpranayanam itīmam agne camasam. imam agne (...) iti camasam*, hardly a tenable text with *iti* preceding and following the *pratika* and *sakala* quotation, and *ca* lacking after *pranītāpranayanam*. Two mss. (M; G) have *śikhāyām pranītāpranayanam cedāpātram cemam agne ...*. The text of BPiS.² is evidently corrupt. For practical reasons this accumulation of implements on the hairtuft (*śikhāyām*) is scarcely possible. Obviously *vedam śikhāyām* should (as in BhārPiS.) precede *śirasta upasādanīyam*. Moreover the text of BPiS.² seems to have been corrupted under influence of BPiS.¹ (from which the *sakala* quotation missing in BhārPiS. also has been adopted). The two versions of the mss. betray the traces of this double influence:

BPiS. ¹			<i>pranītāpranayanam</i>
BPiS. ² (a)	<i>upasādanīyam (...)</i>	<i>idāpātram ca</i>	<i>pranītāpranayanam</i>
BPiS. ² (b)	<i>upasādanīyam (...)</i>		<i>pranītāpranayanam</i>
BhārPiS.	<i>upasādanīyam</i>		
BPiS. ¹	<i>camasam nidadhātī</i>	<i>imam agne ... iti</i>	
BPiS. ²		<i>it īmam agne ... iti</i>	<i>camasam</i>
BPiS. ² (b)	<i>cedāpātram</i>	<i>cemam agne ... iti</i>	<i>camasam</i>
BhārPiS.	<i>idāpātram</i>	<i>cemam agne ... iti</i>	<i>madhye camasam</i>

Presumably *itīmam* forms a corrupt remnant of *nidadhātīmam*.

Miss Raabe's remark, o.c., p. 19 that the *piṣṭasamyavanī* and the *piṣṭo-dvapānī* are different utensils because the first is placed on the abdomen in BPiS.² and BhārPiS., but the latter on the left shoulder in BPiS.¹, is not convincing. BhārPiS. leaving out the shoulders puts the mentioned *piṣṭapātrī* (BPiS.¹ 12) on the abdomen (*udare*, 12). The *dārupātrī* on the abdomen (*udare*, 14) in BPiS.¹ was replaced by BhārPiS., but reintroduced by BPiS.² (14) and put *jathare* (almost synonymous with *udare*).

BPiS.¹ *anvāharyasthālī* + *carusthālī* (*śronyoh*, 18) and *agnihotrasthālī* + *ājyasthālī* (*pādayoh*, 19) have been mixed up by the younger Taittirīyas, *agnihotra-* and *anvāharyasthālī* being placed on the feet (*pratiṣṭhayoh*, BhārPiS. 18; BPiS.² 19). The substitute of *śronyoh* (dual), *nābhyam* (sing.), received one of the remaining *sthālīs*, the *ājyasthālī*. Perhaps this

analysis has to be corrected if our interpretation of *pratiṣṭhayoh* "on the two feet" (cf. *Śrautakośa* I, p. 1044 translation of BPiS²; Kashikar, BhārPiS. 1, 6, 15 "on the feet"; Caland, *ĀpŚS.* 31, 2, 21: "auf die Fusssohlen") is wrong. The Āgñiveśya and Vaikhāṇasa grhyasūtras obviously have interpreted *pratiṣṭhayoh* as "on the twofold bottom by which sitting people are supported". Corresponding to BhārPiS. (18) and BPiS². (19) *agnihotra- + anvāhāryasthālī* : *pratiṣṭhayoh*, ĀgnGS. 3, 4, 2 and VaiGS. 5, 4 have *agnihotra- + anvāhāryasthālī* (VaiGS. corrupt *anvāhāryapacanah*) : *prṣṭhayoh* (19/16) "on the buttocks". If this is not a wrong reinterpretation, *pratiṣṭhayoh* may be equivalent to *śronyoh* meaning "on the buttocks" rather than "on the thighs" (Oertel, o.c., p. 108) or "on the hips" (*Śrautakośa* I, p. 1047).

The mentioned sūtras, placing *ulūkhālamusale* on the jaws and omitting *dārupātrī* (placed *jaṭhare*) and the later added implements *prṣadājyagrahaṇī*, *erakah* and *āśvinakapāle*, follow the younger Taitt. and not BPiS², at least in the first part of the *pātracayanam*, in which they agree almost completely with each other and with BhārPiS. In the second part the order of the distribution shows several differences and ĀgnGS. agrees with BPiS². rather than with BhārPiS. See the following table:

Implements	BhārPiS	BPiS ²	ĀgnGS	VaiGS	Parts of body
<i>ājyasthālī</i>	13	13	12	6	Navel (VaiGS Throat)
<i>śūrpam (-e)</i>	14	15	15	13	Both sides
<i>samṇāyayakumbhyau</i>	15	16	16	14	Groins
(-bham)					(ĀgnGS Nose)
<i>dṛṣadupale</i>	16	17	17	15	Scrotum
<i>vṛṣāravam ; śamyā</i>	17	18	18	—	Penis
<i>agnihotra- +</i>	18	19	19	16	<i>pratiṣṭhayoh</i>
<i>anvāhāryasthālī</i>					(ĀgnGS, VaiGS <i>prṣṭhayoh</i>)
<i>upāvaharaṇīyah</i>	19	20	13	17	<i>pattah</i>
(<i>kūrcāh</i>)					(VaiGS <i>pādayoh</i>)
<i>vedaḥ (kūrcāh)</i>	20	22	20	18	hairtuft
<i>upāsādanīyah</i>	21	21	14	19	<i>śirastah</i>
(<i>kūrcāh</i>)					(VaiGS <i>śirastihāne</i>)
<i>idāpātram</i>	21	22	20	19	<i>śirastah</i>
					(BPiS ² , ĀgnGS hairtuft)
<i>pranītāpraṇayanah</i>	—	22	—	—	hairtuft
<i>camasaḥ</i>	22	—	—	—	<i>madhye</i>

That ĀgnGS. follows BPiS². as well as BhārPiS. is not surprising. The whole context of ĀgnGS. 3, 4 sometimes verbally agrees with BPiS².

and 3, 5 is almost identical to the *dahanakalpa* of BPiS¹. An extensive study of the formation of BPiS². and its relation with the pitṛmedha passage of ĀgnGS. might be interesting. Here it may suffice to say that Caland's remark, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. IV: "Ich halte es für möglich, dass dieser dahanakalpa (i.e. in the secondary BPiS.) ursprünglich für eine andere, den Baudhāyanīyas eng verwandte schule gegolten hat und dass er schon früh dem corpus des Baudhāyana einverleibt worden ist" should not induce us to take ĀgnGS. as the source of BPiS². The *pātracayanam* is contrary to such an assumption. The secondary character of ĀgnGS. appears also in the piling of 3, 5 (the section which copies BPiS¹), where the *cayanam* of BPiS¹ has been influenced by the younger Taittirīyas: insertion of *ulūkhālamusale* on the jaws; *agnihotra- + anvāhāryasthālī* at the feet (*pādayoh*; cf. BhārPiS./BPiS² *pratiṣṭhayoh*, but also ĀgnGS. 3, 4 *prṣṭhayoh*). The late VaiGS. corresponds to the younger Taittirīyas BhārPiS. and ĀgnGS., but not to BPiS².

To conclude this long excursion a few words may be added on the Mānavas (MŚS. 8, 19; ed. J. M. van Gelder, New Delhi 1961), on whose text see Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. VIII: "Auch diesen text halte ich nicht für sehr alt". Indeed the section on the funeral ritual and especially the *pātracayanam* are rather late. The latter seems to be influenced by BPiS¹ (inclusion of the shoulders; the two *samṇāyaya* pots *kukṣyoh*; *ulūkhālamusale* placed *ūrvoḥ*; *vakṣasi* as duplication of *urasi* is hardly tenable and because of its position must be explained as being derived from *vaṅkṣayoh* by way of *vakṣanāyām*?) and by the SV. sūtras and KauśS. (*prāśitraharaṇam* on the forehead; *sphypaveṣau* on both sides; *śakaṭam* at the feet). At the head MŚS. places *kapālāni*, *ājyadhāni* and *vedaḥ* (7), a combination of the implements laid on and at the head and on the hairtuft by the older texts. Interesting is *sahiranyaśakalam purodāśam* on the mouth (*āsye*) (according to Caland, o.c., p. 50 *śronyoh*). The occurrence of *āsye* (8) beside *mukhe* (4) has induced the translator, miss van Gelder (*The Mānava Śrautasūtra*, New Delhi 1963) to take the first as mouth and the latter as face. Perhaps this may be correct since this is obviously a late development of the *pātracayanam*. Originally, however, *mukhe* meant "on the mouth" (the first opening of the head mentioned in the oldest pilings). Second stage: the mouth is replaced by the teeth as the first opening and mentioned after the head (ĀśvGS.). Third stage: the occurrence of the teeth after the head, but not as the first opening, and the insertion of the throat in 4th position (ŚŚS.). Fourth stage: the occurrence of the teeth after the head and the jaws, and the reintroduction of the mouth (4) as first opening of the head (BhārPiS.). Last stage: *mukhe* (4) as first opening (van Gelder: "face") and *āsye* occurring after the head (cf. ŚŚS. "teeth" replacing "mouth") (MŚS.). For *purodāśam* on the mouth (8) compare KauśS., where it is placed on the chest (8!!!).

As to this sūtra-like insertion as a totality I would finally call attention to the fact that this Sāmavedic śrauta text is completely silent on the Sāmans to be sung at the cremation. They are mentioned in the grhya sūtra. Does this imply that the insertion has been adopted from a non-

Sāmavedic source? The gr̥hyasūtra passage cannot have been known to the present section.

46 (end). As soon as¹ he (the sacrificer) may have fallen ill, he should say: "Churn my fire here", where he may have discovered a level ground offering a suitable spot.² He might recover again.³

If this (transference of the fires) has not taken place,⁴ they should, if he were to depart this world, take him (to that spot).

Having thrown the two fires (sc. the gārhapatya and āhavaniya) into two separate pots they should seize⁵ a firebrand from the anvāhāryapacana. They should take the sacrificial implements, clarified butter, water (for cleansing the corpse), pieces of wood (for the pyre), the *anustaraṇī* victim, a razor, and nailscissors.⁶ They go there where he has discovered (selected) a plain offering a suitable spot. Here⁷ they dispose⁸ his fires.

47. Then they dig a hole in this⁹ quarter and shave¹⁰ hair and beard. Having shaved hair and beard they trim his nails. Having trimmed his nails they take out his bowels.¹¹ Having taken out his bowels they remove the faeces. Having removed the faeces they bestrew it (as it is thrown) in the hole with sand. Thereby they cover his sin. Having washed his bowels they put them back (in his body) and take him up. Having¹² laid him down between the (two?)¹³ fires he melts clarified butter on the gārhapatya and purifies it, takes four ladlings, goes¹⁴ to the āhavaniya on which a fire-wood has been put and offers in it, while there is contact between the deceased and himself¹⁵ (reciting:) "He¹⁶ has come into existence through thee, thou through him. He is thy womb, his womb thou art. As a father clearing the way for his son lead him, Jātavedas, to the world of the virtuous. From him thou wast born, he must be born from thee, *svāhā*". He¹⁷ arises immortal from this (fire) in the form of an oblation, consisting of mind, breath, sight, hearing, speech, Ṛc, Yajus, Sāman, Brahman and gold.

48. Then they pile up that funeral pyre. They¹⁸ lay him thereon. On¹⁹ his nostrils he should put down the two *sruva*-ladles; on his right hand the *juhū*; on his left the *upabhyt*; on his chest the *dhruvā*; on his mouth the *agnihotrahavanī*; at his head the *idopahavana*; on his ears the two *prāsitra*-vessels; on his abdomen the *pātrī samavatadhānī*;²⁰ at his testicles the upper and the lower millstones; on his penis the yokepin; over his pudenda the skin of the black antelope; along his back the wooden sword; on both sides the two pestles and

the two winnowing baskets; at his feet the mortar. The other vessels he lays on top²¹ (of his head). They throw the earthen ones away into the water, they give the iron ones²² away. Then they cover him completely (or: fill him)²³ with clarified butter. They pour clarified butter into the sacrificial vessels.

49²⁴ Then they bring the *anustaraṇī* cow.²⁵ Having consecrated her (by sprinkling) and caused her to be lead around (the fires and the pyre) three times to the left²⁶ he should kill her with a hammer.²⁷ Some²⁸ lead her around to the right. But he should not do thus. They²⁹ cut out the omentum and spread³⁰ it on his head. They lay the kidneys on his hands, the heart on his heart, the fore-legs on his arms and distribute the other limbs over his corresponding limbs. Then they cover him with the skin (reciting:) "Prosper with your own body".³¹

Having spread out (the *anustaraṇī*) they set (the pyre) on fire. He³² should try to do it so that the āhavaniya may reach him first — thereby the world of the gods approaches him — [and thereafter that the anvāhāryapacana (reaches him) — thereby the world of the fathers approaches him —; and thereafter that the gārhapatya (reaches him) — thus he³³ obtains a firm basis in this world with progeny and cattle].³²

NOTES

¹ Oertel, o.c., p. 104 translates *yadā* by "if". For my rendering see Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 351 and Macdonell, *Ved. Gr. f. Stud.*, p. 366.

² On *subhūmispaṣṭam* Oertel, o.c., p. 104 observes: "As second member of the compound *-sṛṣṭam* might be conjectured, for if *subhūmispaṣṭam* were "plainly a favourable spot", the order of the members of the compound ought to be reversed". According to Caland, "Über das rituelle Sūtra des Baudhāyana", *Abh. K. M.* 12/1 (1903, repr. 1966), p. 44 f. one should read *yatrāsya samam subhūmi spaṣṭam syāt* (and below *yatrāsya samam subhūmi spaṣṭam bhavati*) and take *asya* (with the force of an instr.) with *spaṣṭam*. His parallels (e.g. BŚS. 4, 1 *yatrāsya yūpo spaṣṭo bhavati*; 10, 22 *yatrāsya svakṛtam iriṇam spaṣṭam bhavati*) are convincing, but accepting his view implies interpreting *subhūmi*- as a *bahuvrīhi*, whereas this term obviously is a *karmadhāraya* GobhGS. 1, 4, 5. As a *bahuvrīhi* it seems to occur in HPiS. 1, 1: 33. 5 *samam vā subhūmim* (Caland's conjecture *samam vā bhūmim* is superfluous). Kashikar's rendering of the identical BhārPiS. 1, 1, 4 "Or (he should select) a good piece of ground which is level" is misleading, since *subhūmi*- cannot be a *karmadhāraya* in this context, but should be taken with *dahanadeśam* (to be supplied from the context). Instead of BPiS. 1, 4 *api vā yaḥ samambhūmih* (sc. *avakāśaḥ*) the almost literal copy of BPiS., ĀgnGS. 3, 5, has *api vā yā samā subhūmih*. So *subhūmi*- may be taken as *karmadhāraya* as well as *bahuvrīhi*. The interpretation of the Subodhinī is rather different from Caland's: *yatra yasmin pradēśe asya āhitāgnes samam animnonnatam su-*

bhūmi· *sasyotpādanakṣma* (r. *kṣama*) *tvādivakṣyamāṇalakṣaṇasahitam* *spāṣṭam*· *prakāśavat* **ssalam* (r. *sthalam*) *labdham* *syāt tat sthalam* (...) *prāpya* *ṛtviḥ brūyāt* . . It seems to interpret *subhūmi* as a bahuvrīhi, *spāṣṭam* as an adjective meaning *prakāśavat* (on this term see Lüders, Sb. Akad. Berlin 24, p. 233 f.) and *samam* as a substantivally used adjective. Though accepting Caland's interpretation I would refer for *spāṣṭa*- (= *prakāśavat*) "clear, clearly discernible, open, wide, not hidden from view (by trees etc.)" to ĀśvGS. 4, 1 *abhitaāśam śmaśānam* "Die Leichenstätte biete nach allen Seiten einen freien Ausblick" (Geldner, *Vedismus und Brahmanismus*, p. 67), "Die Stätte sei ringsum offen" (Max Müller, *Z.D.M.G.* 9, p. II).

³ On the transfer of the fires before death see Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 5. His view (o.c., p. 6) "Für die eigentliche absicht dieses verfahrens ist wohl mit Frazer ("on certain burial customs", in Journ. Anth. Instit. XV, s. 84) zu halten 'the intention of interposing a barrier of fire to prevent the escape of the soul'" was rightly rejected by H. Hartmann, *Der Totenkult in Irland* (Heidelberg 1952), p. 47: "Diese Erklärung steht zu der bei der Handlung klar ausgesprochene Hoffnung, dass die Feuer, 'die ja seine Lebensgeister sind ... richtig geschürt . . ihn durchbringen werden', in klarem Gegensatz". For the Irish and other parallels of the concept that the vital powers rest in one's fires see the same author, p. 46 ff. See also *Agn. a. Prānāgn.*, ch. III.

⁴ In Oertel's translation (o.c., p. 104) "If not, if he should depart this world, then they should take him" *yady u tan na* ("If not") seems to refer to the possibility that the sacrificer should not recover. Evidently this refers to the case of a sacrificer who has not transferred his fires before his death. According to Caland, JGS. ed., p. 10 the Subodhinī seems to analyse *yady u tannayann asmāl lokāt preyāt* (thus runs its text) as *yady u tad nayan* . . Probably, however, the commentary is corrupt and misunderstood by Caland. It takes *īśvaro vāgado* (r. *hāgado*) *bhavitoḥ* with the next sentence: *yady eṣa āhitāgniḥ rogārto 'pi* (r. *'py*) *agado bhavitoḥ*· *arogo bhavitum aham īśvaras*· *samartha iti matvā tat*· *uktalakṣaṇaśmaśānasthalam*· **anaya prāpnuvān*· *vāsmāl lokāt preyāt*· *paralokam gacchet mriyety arthaḥ athainam*· *āhitāgniḥ mṛtam ādadīran*· *uktaśmaśānadeśam prati ṛtviḥ evāprāpayeyur ity arthaḥ*. So the commentator interprets *tannayann* (all the JB. mss. read *tan na yad*) as *tad* (sc. the place of cremation) + *nayann*, hardly to be derived from *nayati* as Caland seems to have supposed, but consisting of the negation *na* + the participle *yann* (from *i*-). The corrupt words *anaya prāpnuvān vā* consequently should represent two negated verbal forms (expressing a movement), *apṛāpnuvān* and a negated (*an*-) form of *i*- (a gerund? One would expect *anivā*, if the verb is not compounded). The wrong interpretation of the Subodhinī (based on a wrong text) then runs: "If the āhitāgni thinking "I may perhaps recover" and therefore not going to the cremation place or not reaching it (in time) dies (at home), they should take him to that place".

⁵ Oertel's punctuation *nānāsthālyor agnī opya hareyur anvāhāryapacanād ulmukam*· *ādadīran yajñapātrāṇi* . . should be adopted. Caland's emendation (*W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 63) places a stop after *hareyuh*. In that untenable punctuation (followed by Raghu Vira) *ulmukam* is deprived of its predicate because *ādadīran* (referring to the transfer of the corpse and the implements) cannot at the same time denote the snatching of a fire-wood from the fire. Śrīnivāsa (whose text reads *opyāhareyuh*) construes *āhareyuh* with *agnī* and supplies this predicate in the next clause with *ulmukam*; a scarcely possible zeugmatic construction!

⁶ For the funeral procession see Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 19 ff. and Oertel, o.c., p. 104, n. 3.

⁷ *tad* does not mean "thus" (Oertel), but "here" (see Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 63). Cf. Śrīnivāsa *tat tatra śmaśānadeśe*.

⁸ *agnīn viharanti* means "They arrange his fires in a *vihāra*" (see also Caland, JGS. ed., p. 10 quoting the Subodhinī) and not "They transfer his fires" (Oertel). Cf. e.g. ŚB. 4, 2, 5, 11.

⁹ A hole is dug to the south of the pyre. See Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 39 and GPiS. 1, 2, 24. According to Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 63 *asyām diśi* implies *dakṣiṇāprācyām diśi*, the pronoun having a deictic force. Cf. BPiS. 1, 1: 4. 4 *imām diśam vihāram kalpayitvā dakṣiṇāprācīm*. Caland, JGS. ed., p. 10, however, quotes the commentary and remarks that the S.W. quarter is meant. Since these words were accompanied by a gesture, it is not possible to establish the exact quarter if all the parallels do not agree. For this use of *asyām diśi*, *imām diśam* etc. see Caland, *Abh. K.M.* 12/1, p. 4. For a similar use of *etām diśam* see Minard, *Trois Enigmes* II, § 17 a (referring to literature on this subject). Because the southern abode of death is denoted, one may assume, besides an indication of oral tradition also a taboo in this use of the pronoun. In the present passage *diśi* may even be a later addition and *asyām* be interpreted as "in the earth". Cf. ŚB. 12, 5, 2, 5 *athainam vipuriṣam kṛtvā asyām puriṣam pratiṣṭhāpayati*.

¹⁰ The shaving etc. takes place at the *śmaśāna* in accordance with the practice of the Mādhy. and Rāṇ. (Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 39, n. 160).

¹¹ For this disemboweling see Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 15. Cf. BhārPiS. 1, 4, 1 (= HirPiS. 1, 4) quoting ŚātB. On this ŚātB. — JB. parallelism Ghosh, *Fragments of Lost Brāhmaṇas* (Calcutta 1935), p. 91 observes: "There is nothing like literal agreement here". The correspondence, however, is greater than his incomplete edition of the ŚātB. quotation and the JB. passage suggests. See the following comparison:

ŚātB.	<i>athainam udare vidārya nirāntram</i>
JB.	<i>nirāntram kurvanti nirāntram</i>
ŚātB.	<i>niṣpuriṣam kṛtvā</i>
JB.	<i>kṛtvā niṣpuriṣam kurvanti</i>
ŚātB.	<i>avaṭe puriṣam avadhāya</i>
JB.	<i>pāṃsubhiḥ kūpe puriṣam abhisamvāpanti pāpmānam evāśya</i>
ŚātB.	<i>prakṣālya pratyavadhāya</i>
JB.	<i>tat pracchādayanti prakṣālyāntrāṇi pratyavadhāyainam</i>
ŚātB.	<i>sarpiṣā pūrayatīti śātyāyanakam</i>
JB.	<i>āharanti . . (athainam sarpiṣābhyutpūrayanti — 1, 48)</i>

BhārPiS. probably does not give a literal quotation, but freely quotes and abridges the ŚātB. passage (notice *sarpiṣā* which in JB. is only found at the end of the next chapter). For instance *āntrāṇi* before or after *pratyavadhāya* is not likely to have failed in the original and is, indeed, found in the Ānandāśrama edition (Poona 1932) of the Satyāśādhāsūtra (which contains HirPiS.). According to ŚātB. the body and especially the abdomen rather than the intestines are filled with liquid butter (unless one assumes a very odd hysteron proteron). So ŚātB. may correspond to JB. 1, 48 *athainam sarpiṣābhyutpūrayanti* (for a different interpretation of *abhyutp-* see, however, n. 23). The quotation does not allow for definite conclusions on the relation between ŚātB. and JB. Oertel, o.c., p. 106, n. 1 is, for that matter,

right in observing that it is doubtful "whether by Śāṭyāyanaka the Brāhmaṇa is necessarily meant. It is quite possible that the term includes the Sūtras".

This disemboweling is mentioned by ĀsvŚS. 6, 10 as the practice of some people (*niṣpurīṣam eke kṛtvā pṛsadājyaṃ pūrayanti*) and BPiS. 1, 2 (followed by the younger Taittirīyas) even rejects it: *niṣpurīṣam kṛtvādbhiḥ prakṣālyā sarpiṣāntṛāṇi pūrayitvā darbhāḥ samsivayati tad u tathā na kuryāt kṣodhukāśya prajā bhavati vijñāyate*. Notice that according to BPiS. (which does not explicitly refer to ŚāṭB.) the intestines seem to be filled with liquid butter. Its authority for the rejection of this practice may have been ŚB. 12, 5, 2, 5, which, however, offers an alternative: *athainaṃ vipurīṣam kṛtvā asyāṃ purīṣam pratiṣṭhāpayati purīṣam vā iyaṃ tat purīṣa evaitat purīṣam dadhāti* (...) *tad u tathā na kuryāt kṣodhukā hāśya prajā bhavati tam antarataḥ prakṣālyājenānvanakti medhyam evainat tat karoti*. In the last clause *enat* should not be interpreted with Eggeling as "it (the body)", but seems to refer to *purīṣam*. The argument for removing the bowels is that from the *vṛkalā* (an intestine?) a jackal (*vṛka-*) is produced when it is burnt. This is not found in JB. Again an indication that this section belongs to an old sūtra rather than to a Jaiminīya/Śāṭyāyana brāhmaṇa? A similar sort of word-magic is applied to the term *purīṣa-* denoting faeces and earth (see Renou, *I.I.J.* 4, p. 108 referring to TS. 5, 3, 5, 2 for another magical use of the two meanings of this term). ŚB. argues that a corpse without bowels (or with empty bowels) brings about an empty stomach in the progeny. So the intestines should remain in the corpse and be purified within the body (*antarataḥ*) by washing and anointing with ghee. Thereby one makes it, sc. the impure faeces, sacrificially pure (*medhyam*). KŚS. 25, 7, 18 f. (...) *vipurīṣam cecchan. keśādi nikhāya sarpiṣāntarakṛtvā citāṃ enam ādadhāti* makes the custom optional, but seems to have been misunderstood by the Karkabhāṣya: *sarpiṣābhyañjanaṃ prakṣālanam ca vipurīṣapakṣa eva*, since *sarpiṣāntarakṛtvā* obviously refers to ŚB. *antarataḥ* .. *ājenānvanakti*. What precisely takes place with the Mādhyamādinās is, however, not wholly clear. Apparently ŚB. accepts opening the abdomen. Even if the point of view of ŚB. may be younger than the (perhaps) rather obsolete practice of the Śāṭyāyana-Jaiminīya school, this does not imply that any conclusion on the relation between ŚB. and JB. may be drawn on the basis of this sūtra-like insertion.

¹² This ritual is performed at home by the Taittirīyas (see Caland, *Bestatungsgebräuche*, p. 13), followed by KauṣGS. 5, 1. Cf. BPiS. 1, 1; BhārPiS. 1, 1, 18. The phrase *gārhapatya ājyaṃ vilāpyotpūya srucci caturghṛtāṃ grhitvā* and the touching of the deceased is found in most parallel texts, but the mantras recited are different. Caland, o.c., p. 32 f. observes: "Nach ankunft auf der cremationsstätte wird von einigen sākhās, nl. den Śaunakins und Mānavas, wenn es sich um einen āhitāgni handelt, von den Kāṭhas und den folgern des Vaikhāṇasasūtra auch sonst ein opfer verrichtet. Allem anschein nach entspricht dieses opfer der spende, welche von den Taittirīyas vor dem aufbruche nach der verbrennungsstätte dem Yama dargebracht wird". The parallelism with the Taittirīyas is, however, far from clear in these texts. Only JB. agrees with the Taitt. except for the mantra and the time of performance. It is irrelevant that in JB. this sacrifice is not performed at home because JB. transfers the whole funeral ritual to the *śmaśāna*. The meaning is identical. The corpse is laid on the vedi (Taitt.) or on the usual place for the vedi, where the funeral pyre later will be construed (JB.), and thereby becomes an oblation. If one looks for a parallel in the other texts, it has to be found in the cremation itself and its accompanying offerings (see Caland, o.c., p. 62 ff.) rather than in the sacrifices performed "nach ankunft

auf der cremationsstätte". In these accompanying āhutis of the cremation the same mantras which here occur in JB. (see n. 16) are used by the parallel texts. Apparently JB. combines the sacrifice at home in which the deceased is transformed into an oblation on the vedi (Taitt.; mantra: *pareyuvāmsam*...) with the cremation ritual in which the deceased on the vedi/pyre forms a real oblation (most sources; mantra: *asmād vai tvam*... or similar formulas). The ritual as described in JB. (the dead is placed on the spot of the vedi, i.e. on the spot reserved for the pyre, and evidently has to be removed during the piling of the pyre) does not appear to be the original. Remarkably enough the mantra *pareyuvāmsam*... which is recited in the Taitt. parallels of the present passage is used by the Śaunakins in the cremation ritual (Caland, o.c., p. 64).

¹³ Perhaps *antarenāgnin nīdhāya* should be read *antarenāgnī nīdhāya*. The corpse is placed on the spot of the vedi, where the pyre is also constructed (see n. 12). The position of this pyre is *antaragni* according to KŚS. (Caland, *Bestatungsgebräuche*, p. 37). In the parallel passage BhārPiS. 1, 1, 18 the corpse is laid between the two (i.e. *gārhapatya* and *āhavanīya*) fires: *antaragni nīpātīyānvāradhe mṛta āhavanīye sruvāhutim juhoti*. The corruption and emendation are rather simple in the context of JB.

¹⁴ Read *gatvā* for the misprint *matvā* of the crit. ed.

¹⁵ *anvāradhe juhoti* "he makes oblation... while he touches (the corpse...)" (Oertel, o.c., p. 105). For the meaning of this *contactus* see Gonda, *Savayajñas*, p. 129 and 153. Now *anvāradha-* may be passive as well as active (Caland, *Z.D.M.G.* 53, p. 215 ff.) and the loc. abs. (*sam*) *anvāradhe* mentioned by Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 233 is rightly given an active meaning. Since the deceased himself cannot take action, he is in a particular situation. There are several passages in favour of Oertel's interpretation "while he touches (the corpse)". The parallel BPiS. 1, 1: 4. 8 reads *pretasya dakṣiṇam bāhum anvārabhya*. Cf. also GPiS. 1, 1, 27 f. (a special rite for those who have neglected their fires) *dakṣiṇena hastena pretam ālabhya savyenāgnim japed* (...) *ājyena dvādaśagṛhītena srucaṃ pūrayitvā pretam agnim savyenānvālabhya* .. *dakṣiṇenāgnau juhuyād*. BPiS. 2, 5: 8. 2 has *pretasya dakṣiṇam bāhum anvārabhya* in the parallel passage. On the other hand BhārPiS. 1, 1, 18 *anvāradhe mṛte* has not invariably been interpreted as "when the dead has been touched". See Caland, *Z.D.M.G.* 53, p. 216: "Im Pitṛmedhasāra S. 14 werden diese Worte durch *pretānvāradhaḥ*, im Prayogadarpaṇa S. 9 durch *pretenānvāradhe* umschrieben; das vorzügliche Bhāṣya des Gopālayajvan sagt zu dieser Stelle; *ātmānam anvāradhe, tasya dakṣiṇam pānim ātmasam-sparsam kṛtvā*. Danach brachte man den rechten Arm des Toten mit dem opfernden Adhvaryu in Berührung". Kashikar translates BhārPiS. 1, 1, 18 "while the deceased is made to touch him". In this connection I may refer also to BhārPiS. 2, 10, 7 (= HirPiS. 2, 10: 58. 4), where the causative in *pretam anvārambhayitvā* also implies that the deceased is made to touch the officiant. The hand of the dead is brought into contact with the performer of the sacrifice. So in a way the dead may be said to touch or grasp the officiant. The reason why *anvāradha-* has been taken in its so-called active sense (on these *-ta* formations see Gonda, *Lingua* 9, p. 65 f.) is the following. By touching the sacrificial substance or the officiant who handles this substance the sacrificial power inherent in the sacrifice is transmitted (Gonda, *Savayajñas*, p. 153). One, thus, receives the benefits of the sacrifice. In the funeral ceremony the dead must be made to participate in the sacrifice performed on his behalf. From a profane point of view the officiant seizes the corpse. The contact is, however, made in the interest of the deceased and not of the offi-

ciant, his medium for the communication with the sacral, immortal sphere. There is, however, no reason why one should not take *anvārabdhe* (without an accompanying noun) as a passive participle if, at least, the correct implication of this *contactus* is borne in mind. In the present passage the vague (passive) loc. abs. *anvārabdhe* "after a contact (between the corpse and the officiant) has been made" perfectly expresses the meaning of the ritual action. The contact as such is important, not the fact that for practical reasons the performer has taken the initiative. If one supplies the deceased as subject in this loc. abs., the most correct translation would seem to be (in view of the meaning of the verbal adjective in *-ta-*) "while the deceased remains in contact (sc. with the performer)". Caland's remark (*Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 13) "Das Kausikasūtra scheint gegen diesen brauch zu polemisieren, indem es sagt: 'den leichnam fasst er nicht an; über einem anderen, des sich noch regt (also einer anderen lebendigen person), spricht er den spruch aus'", is to be corrected. First the translation of *anyam ceṣṭantam anumantrayate* should run (as in *Śrautakośa*, p. 1083) "he should follow with the relevant mantras the rites performed by another person". Moreover this passage does not refer to the sacrifice under discussion at all, but to the funeral rites in general. The performer of the funeral rites should never touch the deceased. The sacrifice described in the present passage does not seem to have any parallel in KauśS.

¹⁶ On these mantras see the introduction to this section.

¹⁷ For the end of ch. 1, 47 (inclusive of the last mantra) compare JB. 1, 2. See also ŚB. 12, 5, 2, 13/15 *tām vā etām yajamānātmāhutam antato juhoti sa yo 'sya svarge loko jito bhavati tata āhutamayo 'mṛtaḥ sambhavati. (...) athaitām āhutam juhoti (...) asmāt tvam adhi jāto 'si tvad ayaṃ jāyatām punaḥ. asau svargāya lokāya svāhā.*

¹⁸ The Subodhinī reads *ādadhātī* instead of *ādadhāti* and at the end of this chapter *upari nidadhātī* instead of *upari dadhati* (crit. ed. *upanidadhāti*). In this sūtra-like description of the ritual the indicative shows a preference for the plural, whereas the optative mostly stands in the singular except in ch. 46 (where the singular would be quite out of place) and 1, 47 *juhoti*. See 1, 48 *tasyām enam ādadhāti tasya nāsikayos sruvau nidadhyāt (...) pariśiṣṭāni yajñapātrāny upari dadhati*; 1, 49 *anustaraṇīm ānayanti tām (...) kūṭena hanyāt pradakṣiṇam tad u tathā na kuryāt; samstīryopadīpayanti sa tathaiva cikīrṣed yathā ...* So the reading of the crit. ed. should be retained.

¹⁹ For the piling of the sacrificial implements (and a comparison with parallels) see the introduction of this section.

²⁰ Instead of *saṃvartadhānīm* (mss. ra, la, śa: *saṃvattadhānīm*) read with Oertel, o.c., p. 107 *samavattadhānīm*. Śrīnivāsa's text has *saṃvartadhānīm*, his commentary *saṃ(a)vattadhānīm*. I have not followed his interpretation which separates *pātrīm* (i.e. *vṛhipātrīm*) from *samavattadhānīm* (see Caland, JGS. ed., p. 10).

²¹ Raghu Virā: *upanidadhāti*; Oertel: *upari dadhati* (thus one ms. of the crit. ed.); Śrīnivāsa's text: *upari nidadhātī* (cf. n. 18); commentary: *upari-citopari*. At any rate *upari* (with or without *ni-*) meaning "above the head" should be read, as appears from the parallels.

²² ŚB. 12, 5, 2, 14 disapproves of giving stone and earthen vessels to a brahmin and prescribes that they should be thrown into the water (*apa evaināny abhyavahareyuh*). According to its sūtra (KŚS. 25, 7, 32 f.), which may have been influenced by JB., the metal vessels may be given optionally to a brahmin. Does BPiS. 1, 6 *apo mṛnmayāny abhyavahareyuh apo mṛnmayāny abhyavaharantī* (cf. JB. *apo mṛnmayāny abhyavaharanti vijñāyate* (...)

brāhmaṇebhyo 'yasmayāni lohamayāni ca dadyuh refer to JB. (especially in the quotation)? The son keeps all those implements and the millstones according to ĀśvGS. 4, 3, 18 f. and KauśS. 81, 18 f. (following ĀśvGS.?) makes the son keep the iron vessels and one millstone and has the earthen ones thrown into the water.

²³ *athainam sarpiṣābhyutpūrayanti* "Then they fill him up with liquid butter" (Oertel). Śrīnivāsa: *athainam paretam sarpiṣā pūṇāntaram kurvanti*. How should one conceive of this filling with ghee? Is it poured into the abdomen which is still open (see n. 11)? Since all the openings are already covered with implements, pouring ghee into the prāṇa-openings seems to be excluded here. The only filling mentioned in other texts is that of the implements which have a cavity. Therefore *abhyutpūrayati* may have a different meaning, for which I refer to M.-W. s.v. *pri-* (p. 648). It may have the meaning "to cover completely, overspread, bestrew" since MBh., which would be very suitable in this context. Cf. GPiS. 1, 2, 32 f. *evam ājyam mukhe prathamam ninīya pādaprābhṛtyā mukhāntāc ca santatam śeṣam*. Is *yajñapātreṣu sarpiṣā āśiṅcanti* a gloss on *abhyutpūrayanti*?

²⁴ For a translation of this chapter see also Hertel, *Die Weisheit der Upanischaden*, p. 153 f. and Frenz, *I.I.J.* 11 (1969), p. 127 f.

²⁵ The *anustaraṇī* ritual is not mentioned by the late Taitt. sūtras ĀgnGS. and VaiGS. Perhaps it went out of use. For those who had not performed an animal-sacrifice this rite should be omitted according to BPiS. 2, 3, or the victim should be released (as in the case of an *anāhitāgni*). In some texts the killing of the cow seems to be optional.

²⁶ According to BPiS. 1, 7 and BhārPiS. 1, 4 the victim is only lead around if it is to be released. This restriction is not made by KauśS. 81, 20 and the Jaiminīyas. On the *circumambulatio* see Caland, *Een indogermaansch Lustratiegebruik*, Amsterdam Acad. 1898. The turning to the left may be explained as a "Spiegelbildritus" (Gonda, *Religionen Indiens* I, p. 131), as is usual in the funeral rites, but the intention may also have been a protection of the living against the bad influence of the dead in the same way as the opposite turning by the right (*pradakṣiṇam*) protects the sphere within the *circumambulatio* against the evil from outside. Instead of *apasalam* (Oertel) Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 63 proposes to read *apasali*. The crit. ed. conjectures *apasalīm* (two mss. having *avasali*, the rest *apasali*). See also JB. 1, 345, where the crit. ed. reads *apasalair* (mss. *avasali*; ms. va: *avasali*), but according to Caland, *Over en uit het JB.*, p. 24 the correct reading should be *avasali*. Cf. Caland's note on ĀpŚS. 24, 22, 1 (*prasavi*); Renou, *J.As.* 231, p. 234; miss Gaastra, *Jaiminīyaśrautasūtra* (Leiden 1906), p. 10, n. 4 (*prasali*).

²⁷ Oertel did not emend *kūṭe* to *kūṭena* (which was not found in his mss.), because he felt "quite uncertain whether *kūṭa* always means 'hammer' and not also 'forehead'" (o.c., p. 114, n. 2). In *tasya na kūṭena praghnanti mānuṣam hi tan no eva paścāt karmam pīṭṛdevatyam hi tat* (ŚB. 3, 8, 1, 15; quoted by Oertel) *kūṭena* cannot mean "on the frontal bone" (tr. Eggeling), as Oertel admits, but in his view "the evident contrast between *kūṭena* and *paścāt* is destroyed", if we translate "hammer". The contrast, however, is not between the spots to be hit, but between two manners of killing. "Behind the ear" is *pīṭṛdevatyam* since it is usual in the funeral rites of the Mādhyamīnas (see KŚS. 25, 7, 35). The instrument to be used may be an ordinary stick, but not a hammer (by which the skull is smashed in). Killing by means of a hammer seems to be *mānuṣa*-. One may perhaps compare JB. 1, 46, where the deceased is knocked down with a hammer by the Rtu. So *kūṭena* of the crit. ed. (see also Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 63) is correct in JB., which does not prescribe

a killing behind the ear. The cow is also not to be killed with a sword; cf. BPiS. 1, 4 *tām anyatraiva śāstrād* (thus should be read; see Caland, ĀpŚS. 31, 2, 8, n. 1) *ghnanti*. The younger Taitt. have the victim killed *apīdhāya mukham* (BhārPiS. 1, 5, 1). For parallels of this death from asphyxiation (Kashikar's translation of BhārPiS. "cover her face" misses the point) see Gonda, *Savayajñas*, p. 261. MŚS. 8, 19, 17 *ajām gām vaihavarnām dakṣiṇā-parasyām diśi śavanīrharāṇasya prathinā ghātayet* (crit. app. ed. van Gelder: mss. *prathinām*, cf. RV. 1, 8, 5, or r. *prathitām*) has been translated by miss van Gelder "He has a one-coloured she-goat or cow killed, as large as (the corpse), south-east of (the place where) the corpse is carried away". This interpretation does not seem to be convincing because of the word-order (the genitive following *diśi*). Moreover it is doubtful if *dakṣiṇāparasyām diśi* can be construed with a genitive and mean "south-east of". What is "(the place where) the corpse is carried away" in the funeral ritual? *Śrautakośa* I, p. 1067 renders "... by means of the extended portion of the bamboo used for the bier", a dubious but ingenious interpretation. KauśS. 81, 21 *tām nairrtena jaghanatāghnanta upaveśayanti* "She should be made to sit down towards the south-west while being hit on the hips" (*Śrautakośa* I, p. 1085) is likewise an obscure passage. Should *upaveśayanti* be regarded as an euphemistic expression meaning "they kill"? In that case *jaghanataḥ* hardly means "on the hips"; perhaps "from behind". All these passages are obscured by the taboo sphere of killing a victim (especially in the funeral rites). The victim should be killed without making any roaring.

²⁸ I have not traced these *eke*.

²⁹ The distribution of the *anustarani*'s parts of the body generally agrees with the parallel texts. See Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 54.

³⁰ For *parivayanti* read with Oertel *parivyayanti*. Compare the mantra *agner varma pari gobhir vyayasva* ... which is i.a. found BPiS. 1, 7. After *parivyayanti* a stop has to be placed. The remaining accusatives depend on *vicinvanti*. In fact *vi-* only refers to *itarāṇy aṅgāni* and expresses the idea of distribution. For the other accusatives *cinvanti* ("they pile") has to be supplied from *vicinvanti* ("they distribute").

³¹ No parallels.

³² *sa tathaiva cikīrṣed yathainam āhavanīyaḥ prathamō gacchet tad enam devalokaḥ pratyāgacchati. atha yathānvāharyapacanas tad enam pītṛlokaḥ pratyāgacchati. atha yathā gārhapatyas tathāsmīn loke prajāyā ca paśubhiś ca pratītiṣṭhati*. Oertel's interpretation "He should endeavor to do it in this way: If the āhavanīya-fire should reach him first, then the world of the gods approaches him; and if (...) then (...); and if (...) then ..." is hardly tenable. Obviously *tathā* and *yathā* are correlatives. For *yathā* ... *tad* meaning "if ... then" no parallels are to be found (in *atha yathāmuṣm lokam apyeti* at the end of JB. 1, 45 obviously *yadā* should be read instead of *yathā*). The desiderative and prescriptive optative *cikīrṣed* would be out of place if *yathā* introduces three possibilities arising at the kindling of the pyre. On the other hand some parallels seem to support Oertel's interpretation. Cf. ŚB. 12, 5, 2, 9 ff.; ĀśvGS. 4, 4, 2 (apparently based on ŚB.); LŚS. 8, 8, 34 (= DŚS.); MŚS. 8, 19, 20 (derived from the SV. sūtras?); BPiS. 1, 7. See also Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 58. His interpretation of ĀśvGS. *svargaloka enam prāpad* "die himmelswelt hat ihn erreicht" (o.c., p. 59, n. 230; contrary to Müller, Stenzler and Oldenberg, who regard *svargaloka* as a locative) seems to be confirmed by JB. The difference with those passages is that there all the fires are brought into contact with the pyre at the same time (*yugapad*). The reaching of the corpse by the respective fires forms an *augurium* with

regard to the future of the deceased. In JB. this *augurium* is lacking, as appears from the form *cikīrṣed* (an *augurium* should not be influenced by human actions). The officiant should (opt.) try (desider.) to do the kindling in such a way that the *āhavanīya* reaches the body first, and thereafter that the *anvāharyapacana* reaches it; *atha (tathā cikīrṣed) yathā* ... (with an ellipsis of *enam* ... *gacchet*, and not, as Oertel assumes, of *prathamah*). This is also Windisch's interpretation, *Ber. K.S.G.W.* 59 (1907), p. 116: "Er (...) suche es so zu machen, dass (...), hierauf, dass (...), hierauf, dass ...". Similarly Hertel, o.c., p. 154. In the interpretation by Frenz, o.c., p. 127 f. "[Der Adhvaryu] soll es dabei so einzurichten suchen, dass den [Toten] das Āhavanīya-Feuer zuerst erreicht, dann öffnet sich dem [Toten] die Götterwelt. Wen [er es aber so einrichtet], dass (...) [zuerst erreicht], dann ...", the principle of the ellipsis does not seem to be understood. His rendering "Wenn" is odd, since it cannot refer to *yathā* (translated with "dass") or *atha* (which is not a subordinating conjunction). Perhaps, however, this passage was originally much shorter. See the Subodhinī and the Introduction of this Section.

³³ Hertel, o.c., p. 154 translates "in dieser Weise fasst man (d.h. der Sohn, die Erben) in dieser Welt festen Fuss durch Nachkommen wie durch Vieh". This change of subject is improbable. With Oertel one should consider this sentence to be inappropriate, as, for that matter, the whole JB. version of this topic is inappropriate and secondary without the *augurium*. Frenz, o.c., p. 128 translates "dann bleibt [der Tote] in dieser Welt [d.h. auf Erden] durch [seine] Nachkommen und durch [sein] Vieh bestehen", which is hardly tenable. Do people live on by their cattle? The expression *asmin loke prajāyā ca paśubhiś ca pratītiṣṭhati* usually refers to living sacrificers who become substantial. There seems to be no covert allusion to the doctrine of transmigration. This phrase rather has to be explained as due to systematizing (*gārhapatyā* means this world, means cattle and progeny in classifications).

51-65. Expiations

The following fifteen chapters (arranged in ten sections) deal with the expiations in the agnihotra ritual. On expiations in general see W. Gampert, *Die Sühnezeremonien in der indischen Rechtsliteratur*, Prague 1939; H. de Willman-Grabowska, "L'expiation (prāyaścitti) dans les Brāhmaṇa", *Bull. intern. de l'Acad. Polon.*, 1935, p. 237 ff.; J. von Negelein, *Aiharvaprāyaścittāni*, New Haven 1915 (also published in *J.A.O.S.* 33 and 34). The section JB. 1, 51-65 has been edited by Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 23 (1902), pp. 331 ff. together with the parallel version of ŚB. For the agnihotra expiations see *Śrautakośa I, Sanskrit Section*, p. 83 ff. and *English Section*, p. 145 ff. The prāyaścittis of TB. have been translated by P.-E. Dumont, *Mélanges d'Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou* (Paris 1968), p. 243 ff.

Caland, *Over en uit het JB.*, p. 36 f. already observed that the expiations of JB. might have been borrowed from ŚB. His argument that the controversy with the Taittiriya in 1, 52 (= ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 4) is typically Yajurvedic and does not seem to have originated with the Sāmavedic JB., can now be supplemented with more (and perhaps stronger) proofs. See the Introductions of most of the following Sections and also n. 1 and 2 of 51-52; n. 1 and 5 of 53-54; n. 13 of 55-56; n. 5 of 61. Older than the ŚB. expiations are those of TB. and AB., to which ŚB. sometimes refers. Incidentally JB. seems to have been influenced by the sources of its own source; especially TB. See for the relation TB.-JB. the Introductions of 53-54; 58-59 and 62-63 (as well as Section 51-52, n. 7). The last prāyaścitti of 1, 65, which has no parallel in ŚB., was taken from AB. The version of JB. seems to be superior to ŚB. only once or twice. The transmission of the manuscripts of the latter, though being far better than that of JB., may be incidentally unreliable. See the Introduction of 55-56 and also 61, n. 16; 62-63, n. 3. Often the inconsistencies and the vagueness in the text of JB. seem to be due to careless or automatic borrowing. That the arrangement of the JB. expiations sometimes can only be explained as due to the order of the passages in the ŚB. source is contrary to the hypothesis of a common source. See e.g. Section 56 (last paragraph). This is especially significant because the prāyaścitti sections of ŚB. and JB. are on the whole differently arranged. JB. takes the related expiations together, whereas ŚB. in general bears in mind the sequence in the ritual when possible accidents can occur, i.e. it tries to follow the course of the agnihotra.

The first expiation (something passes between the fires) is indifferent as to the point of time. The beginning of 1, 52 does not coincide with a new expiation. The second expiation starts at the beginning of 1, 53 with the stock phrase *tad āhuḥ yad etasya dīrghasattriṇaḥ* . . (cf. 1, 51). JB. keeps running parallel to ŚB. in that the spilling during milking takes place at the beginning of the rite. JB. continues with the other

spilling of the milk (introduced by *atho khalv āhuḥ* and not beginning a new chapter), whereas further on ŚB. deals separately with these later accidents. JB. regards the accident where something impure falls into the milk as an entirely independent expiation and consequently makes it coincide with the beginning of a new chapter (1, 55) introduced with the stock phrase *tad āhuḥ yad etasya dīrghasattriṇaḥ*. JB. again takes all the related expiations together. ŚB. first deals with the pollution of the milk during and after milking and after the milk has been put on the fire. Then the text continues with other accidents and only at 12, 4, 2, 9 returns to the pollution of the milk (after it has been ladled in the spoon; i.e. in accordance with the course of the agnihotra ritual). Rain falling upon the milk does not form an independent expiation in JB. (1, 56) because it seems to be interpreted as belonging to the pollution of the milk. On the other hand the position of this expiation in the arrangement is remarkably parallel to ŚB. (12, 4, 2, 10 after 12, 4, 2, 9 *srucy unnītam amedhyam āpadyeta*), where the chronological order is decisive. The extinction of the coals (last paragraph of 56), though not connected with the preceding expiations, is introduced with *atho khalv āhuḥ*. The position of this expiation agrees perfectly with the ŚB. version, where *pūrvasyām āhutyām hutāyām* correctly follows on *srucy unnītam* in the preceding expiation. In borrowing from ŚB. the two principles of arrangement seem to have been confused by JB. Does the fact that the expiring of the sacrificer directly follows on the expiring of the fire (*atho khalv āhuḥ* . .) imply that in this chapter (1, 57) JB. returns to its systematical arrangement? The sitting down of the cow starts a new chapter (1, 58; *tad āhuḥ yad etasya* . . etc.) as an entirely new expiation. For obvious reasons ŚB. has placed this passage more at the beginning of the prāyaścitti section. JB. 1, 60 incorrectly introduces a new expiation (*tad āhuḥ yad etasya* . .). See the introduction of the Sections 58-59 and 60. On the other hand the expiation for the presence of blood in the milk of the cow, which in ŚB. is also the next prāyaścitti (but opens a new chapter: 12, 4, 2, 1), forms the second paragraph of JB. 1, 60 introduced by *atho khalv āhuḥ*. The last five chapters are announced by *atho khalv āhuḥ* at the end of the preceding chapters. They deal with the fires (extinction, fusion, etc.) and mostly have no relation with the chronological course of the process (the criterion for the arrangement of ŚB.). In the systematical arrangement of these expiations ŚB. and JB. to some extent agree, but sometimes the interpretation of the expiation brings about disagreements. For instance taking out fire to a fire which is still burning may be regarded as a fusion (JB. 1, 65) or be connected with the extinction of a fire (ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 4).

The relation between the other brāhmaṇas is less clear, but it may be assumed that AB. (at least partly) is younger than TB. See the introduction of Section 51-52; 61; 62-63. The expiations of KS. and MS. (of which the latter may be based on the former) are the oldest.

51-52. *Vehicles or animals pass between the fires*

For this first expiation compare ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 1-5 (for other parallels see below). In principle the two brāhmaṇas regard this expiation as superfluous (except for the passing of three unclean animals between the fires). Von Negelein's remark (*Atharvaprāyaścittāni*, p. XVIII) "Der freigeistigen Richtung, welche eine Hauptquelle des Śatapathabrāhmaṇa so deutlich kennzeichnet, entspricht es, dass selbst das Omen der eben erwähnten Opferzerreissung nur eine Loskaufszereemonie (*niṣkṛti*) und eine Spende (*iṣṭi*) erheischt. Nach noch liberalerer, eben dort erwähnter Auffassung soll man auf das Eindringen fremder Dinge oder lebender Wesen in keinem Falle, selbst dann nicht achten, wenn eine ganze Schar (*grāma*) es verübte" needs, however, some corrections. First *niṣkṛti* does not mean "Loskaufszereemonie" (this was also observed by Gampert, *Sühnezereemonien*, p. 29, n. 1), but "expiation". Secondly the *iṣṭi* is hardly a kind of liberalism, but seems to refer to passages like MS. 1, 8, 9 . . . *iti juhuyād yady ano vā ratho vāntarā viyāyāt*. Thirdly the liberalism of ŚB. is not so much based on indifference "wenn es sich um unwichtige Einzelheiten handelt" (in ritualism no detail is unimportant), as on a changing outlook. The constituents of the rite are equated with cosmic entities (this is, indeed, not entirely new) and (what is more important) from these equations a conclusion is drawn. If the two fires are heaven and earth, it is irrelevant to object to a passing of animals between them. These new conceptions may have originated with the ŚB. teachers. See also ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 11 (= JB. 1, 60), where Āruṇi, basing himself on the equations *agnihotrī* = heaven, *vatsaḥ* = wind/sun and *agnihotrasthālī* = earth, observes: *na vā evaṃ viduṣo 'gnihotrī naśyati kva hy asau naśyet* . . . AB. 7, 12, 3 similarly does not take offence at the passing of carts or dogs (r. *śvā*, not *'śvā*) between the fires, arguing that these fires are placed in oneself: *ātmany asya hitā* (not: *hi tā*) *bhavanti* (cf. ŚB. 2, 2, 2, 17 and see *Agn. a. Prānāgn.*, ch. III). It prescribes, however, a detailed expiation in case one takes offence.

For the three unclean animals which may give rise to an expiation, viz. *durvarāha* *ḷakaś* *śvā*, see TB. 1, 4, 3, 6 and AB. 7, 12, 3, which only mention the dog, and the Taitt. sūtras: BŚS. 27, 5 . . . *gaur mahiṣo varāhaḥ*; BhārŚS. 9, 9, 3 (after dealing with the expiation for the passing of a dog between the fires) *etad eva sūkaraiḥ* (mss. *sūkaresake*, *sūkarairake*, *sūkaraisake*; read perhaps *sūkaraiḍake*); ĀpŚS. 9, 10, 15 (not exclusively referring to the agnihotra) . . . *durvarāhaḍako vā*; HirŚS. 15, 3, 25 . . . *gaur varāha ḍako vā*. The triad of the brāhmaṇas is the most original one. See BhārŚS. 9, 9, 1-3, where the dog, the hog and the *ḷakaś* or perhaps *ḍaka* are combined. ĀpŚS. 9, 10, 15 adds the *durvarāha* and *ḍaka* to an enumeration consisting of man, dog, cart and chariot. In the same enumeration HirŚS. 15, 3, 25 adds *gaur* before *varāhaḥ*. Was *durvarāhaḥ* later corrupted into *gaur varāhaḥ* in the

enumeration which contains besides unclean animals (the dog, the hog, and the goat) also unoffensive items such as man or chariots? This would imply that HirŚS. and the 27th book of BŚS. (BŚS. 14, 23 deals with the old TB. expiation of the dog passing between the fires) are younger than (this section of) ĀpŚS.

The *ḷake* to whom JB. 1, 52 refers in connection with the throwing of ashes are the Taittiriya (TB. 1, 4, 3, 6, which is much more accurately quoted by ŚB. than by JB.). Caland, *Over en uit het JB.*, p. 36 f. rightly observed that this polemic directed towards the Black YV. (one of the current topics in ŚB.) seems to indicate that JB. has borrowed from ŚB.

The arrangement of the expiation in ŚB. (12, 4, 1, 5) is more systematic than in JB. (1, 52, third paragraph): a) the Viṣṇu mantra restores the interrupted continuity of the rite; b) the water purifies the pollution by the unclean animals. In JB. both the mantra and the water are purifying. This makes the statement *tad yad evātra yajñasyāśantam bhavati* . . . rather superfluous whereas in ŚB. these words are essential. The restoration of the continuity by going from the gārhapatya to the āhavanīya is not explained as such by JB., which, in borrowing this section from ŚB., apparently has not been careful in all respects.

On the meaning of this first expiation see D. J. Hoens, *Sānti. A Contribution to Ancient Indian Religious Terminology* (thesis Utrecht 1951), p. 43: "The road between the Gārhapatya and the Āhavanīya has been polluted by an impure animal or a profane vehicle passing by, that is to say: a foreign power has entered into the sphere of the sacrifice and has broken the continuity required for its success". The difference between two kinds of evil (interruption and pollution) should be more stressed. The passing of a vehicle originally constituted an independent case. MS. 1, 8, 9: 130. 9 mentions only a cart and a chariot. TB. 1, 4, 4, 10 deals only with the passing of vehicles, which is regarded as an interruption (and not as a pollution) and may be simply expiated by extinguishing the āhavanīya and taking out anew from the gārhapatya. TB. 1, 4, 3, 6, however, considers the passing of a dog to be an interruption as well as a pollution. The text criticizes the leading of a cow and the pouring of water over the track. According to Caland (in a note on his translation of ĀpŚS. 9, 6, 11) this should refer to MS. Probably MS. (which does not mention a dog) has inaccurately borrowed from its source, and TB. directly refers to this same source which either exclusively dealt with the passing of dogs or already had combined this expiation with the passing of vehicles. TB. replaces the cow and the water as an expiation against pollution by ashes (*bhasmanā padam apivapati śāntyai*) and scatters ashes from fire to fire in order to remove the interruption. AB. 7, 12, 3 combining the dog and the vehicles and showing a more modern outlook ("he should not pay heed to it' they say") seems to represent a younger stage. ŚB. (followed by JB.) criticizes TB. It combines AB. (pouring of water from fire to fire) with TB. (recitation of the Viṣṇu mantra).

Among the sūtras the Taitt. follow their brāhmaṇa in maintaining the difference between the two kinds of expiations. BhārŚS. 9, 9, 3

seems to add two animals to the dog under influence of ŚB. (or JB.). On the other hand the younger Taitt. have a separate expiation in which the two TB. expiations, the interruption by a vehicle and the pollution by a dog (and other animals taken from other sources), are combined: BhārSS. 9, 14, 4 ff. (man, dog, cart and chariot pass between the fires; according to others this should apply only to vehicles, as the sūtra states) forms a combination of MS. 1, 8, 9 (dealing with the passing of vehicles, but criticized TB. 1, 4, 3, 6 in the expiation for the passing of dogs) and TB. 1, 4, 4, 10 (the passing of a vehicle). HirSS. 15, 3, 25 ff. more or less agrees with Bhār., but adds to the items passing between the fires the cow, the hog and the wild goat (under influence from ŚB. ?). See also ĀpSS. 9, 10, 15 (agreeing with HirSS., but reading *durvarāhaḥ* instead of *gaur varāhaḥ*), where the mantra accompanying the leading of the cow over the track is not (as in MS.) *trayastrīṃśat tantavaḥ* .. (this mantra being connected with the wrong expiation by ĀpSS. 9, 10, 14; see Caland's note on his translation). The expiation of Āpastamba (followed by VaiSS. 20, 19) does not (exclusively) refer to the agnihotra. AthPr. (a compilation of old and late prāyaścittis which does not form a unity) preserves at 5, 2 the twofold treatment of this expiation, whereas 1, 3 f. combines the dog and the vehicles. The latter passage as well as ŚSS. 2, 6, 13 are based on AB. MŚS. 3, 4, 9 f. is influenced by the Taitt. and seems to be rather young (besides vehicles the text refers to all kinds of living beings including man, horses, crows). BŚS. 27, 5 also seems to be late. ĀśvSS. 3, 10 ff. forms a combination of several expiations (AB.; MS.; TB.; vehicles, dogs, man).

51. It is assuredly a long sacrificial session upon which they enter who offer the agnihotra.¹ This is indeed a session (only) to be broken off through old age.² For one is absolved from it either by old age or by death.

Now they say: "If between the fires³ of this performer of a long sacrificial session, viz. the offerer of the agnihotra,⁴ a yoked⁵ (vehicle) should drive through or if there should be walked⁶ (between these fires by living beings), what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?"

The wheel (of that vehicle) is the Vajra (i.e. Indra's thunderbolt shaped like a discus). The Vajra goes alongside his fires, between whose fires a yoked (vehicle) drives through or (living beings) walk.⁷ He may⁸ perform an expiation and may also offer an oblation. But he should not consider it thus. For he who establishes his sacrificial fires covers these worlds.

For him the gārhapatya becomes this world, the anvāhāryapacana the space between and the āhavanīya yonder world. In these worlds birds, both yoked in groups⁹ and single, pass to and fro¹⁰ as they

like. He should opine: "Even if a crowd has gone between my fires, this does not mean any misery and misfortune for me".

But, indeed, there are three domestic animals which are impure,¹¹ viz. the hog, the ram¹² and the dog. If any one of these should move¹³ between (his fires), what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?"

52. Now there are also some people who go scattering a handful of ashes (?)¹⁴ from the gārhapatya up to the āhavanīya¹⁵ with this verse: "Here Viṣṇu strode".¹⁶ But he should not do it thus. If in that case any one should say: "Surely he has scattered the ashes of the sacrificer. Soon afterwards he will (really) scatter his ashes.¹⁷ He will lose¹⁸ the chief of the house¹⁸", then that would indeed come to pass so.

He should proceed thus: Having taken a water-pot or a water-jar he should go pouring it out from the gārhapatya to the āhavanīya with the verse: "Here Viṣṇu strode". The *ṛc* is a divine purification,¹⁹ water is a divine purification. Whatever here is unappeased of the sacrifice and whatever is impure, for all that, water forms the means of appeasing. So by water they appease it.²⁰

NOTES

¹ *dirghasatram ha vā eta upayanti ye 'gnihotram juhvati*. The same sentence is found in the version of ŚB. See also ŚB. 11, 3, 3, 2 *dirghasatram vā eṣa upaiti yo brahmacaryam upaiti*. In ŚB. the agnihotra is called a *dirghasattra* in order to link up the *prāyaścitti* section with the preceding sections dealing with *sattras* (e.g. the thousand year session), whereas in JB. which borrows this passage the emphasis on the *sattraship* has no function in the context.

² *etad āha vai sattram jarāmūriyam* (ŚB. *etad vai jarāmāryam sattram yad agnihotram*). Cf. TĀ. 10, 64, 1 (= MNU. 547; ed. J. Varenne, Paris 1960) *etad vai jarāmāryam agnihotram sattram* "Oui, c'est cela le sacrifice quotidien ne qu'il fera jusqu' à ce qu' il meure de vieillesse" (Varenne); "Dieses, fürwahr, ist sein bis zu Alter und Tod dauerndes Agnihotram, sein Sattram" (Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*). Eggeling, *S.B.E.* 44, p. 178 translates "a long session ensuring death in old age" and observes that "old-age-deathed" or "having old age for its extreme limit" seem to be the literal meaning of *jarāmāryam* and that the author "apparently takes it in the former sense, though interpreting the compound in his own way". In the quoted translations the interpretations of the compound are hardly tenable. The meaning is either "relating to old age and death (*marah*)" (no idea of limitation being expressed) or "having old age as its limit (*maryā*)" (without any reference to death). The latter analysis seems to be preferable because the idea of limitation has to be explicitly expressed by the compound itself and the duration of the rite (*agnihotra* = *dirghasattra*) should be mentioned. On the other hand it is conceivable that old age as well as death are the only factors which end the agnihotra. The reading *jarāmūriyam* of JB., if derived from **jarāmūra-* (as Oertel, o.c., p. 331, n. 1 referring to PB. 15, 17, 3 *jiryamūra* —

read 25, 17, 3 and *jīryā mūra* — assumes), does not make sense because in this context “destined for one who is worn out by old age” does not make clear why the agnihotra is a *dirghasattra*. Presumably *jarāmarya*- meaning “having *jarā* for its limit” was reinterpreted by the author of ŚB. by means of a typical brāhmaṇa “etymology” JB. borrowed this explanation, but substituted *jarāmūriya*- for *jarāmarya*- (perhaps under influence of PB. 25, 17, 3, where *jīryā muraḥ* occurs in the context of a *dirghasattra* of thousand years). For the original ŚB. version see also AthPr. 3, 6 *jarāmaryam vā etat sattraṃ yad agnihotram iti śrutir bhavati* and *Grhastharatnākara* (B.I. ed.), 102/12 *jarāmarṭtyāyaivaṃ satrāya dīkṣate* (apparently quoted from Hārīta), which is explained by *jarāmaranaparyyantam atirekāḍ anuṣṭhānam kāryyam* (103/13).

³ JB. reads *agnin* against ŚB. *agnī*. The parallels (TB. 1, 4, 4, 10; AB. 7, 12, 4) prove that two fires, the *gārhapatya* and the *āhavanīya*, are meant. On the other hand ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 3 has *antareṇa grāmo 'gnin viyāyāt*. That plural is undoubtedly due to the context which refers to the identity of the three worlds and the three fires. In *yo 'gnin ādhatte* (JB. 1, 51) the plural has to be accepted on the same grounds. JB. *agnin antareṇa : agnin ādhatte* = ŚB. *antareṇāgnī : agnī (!) ādhatte*.

⁴ The mss. (except *ya*) read *agnim juhvato* instead of *agnihotram juhvato* (ŚB.). Even if the reduction of *agnihotram* to *agnim* may be acceptable (see Oertel, o.c., p. 331, n. 5 referring to literature on this subject), I doubt whether *agnim* is correctly retained (by Oertel and the crit. ed.) in this stereotyped phrase, which is found in the chapters 53; 55; 58 and 60 with the reading *agnihotram*.

⁵ *yuktam* stands for *ratha*- or *anas* of the parallel texts (TB. 1, 4, 4, 10; AB. 7, 12, 3; MS. 1, 8, 9) and therefore does not primarily mean “team” (Eggeling), but “(horse-)drawn vehicle”; a vague expression which includes *anas* as well as *ratha*-, just as *sam . . careyuh* does not specify the animals which may pass between the fires. Not the team of horses, but the vehicle and especially its wheels make the dangerous incision in the continuity of the sacrifice. For *yuktam* compare ṢaḍvB. 1, 2, 10 *ano yuktam* “this cart . . yoked (with two oxen)” (tr. Bollée).

⁶ The subject of *sam . . careyuh* are all sorts of animals rather than “people” (Eggeling). The vagueness of the original is best retained in a passive construction.

⁷ *vajro vai cakrah vajro vā etasyāgnin anveti yasyāntareṇa yuktam vā viyāti sam vā caranti* is not found in the ŚB. version and in Oertel's edition (see, however, his note 4, o.c., p. 331, in which some corrupt fragments of this passage are quoted). This insertion in the expiation borrowed from ŚB. has been adopted from TB. 1, 4, 4, 10 *vajro vai cakram vajro vā etasya yajñam vicchinatti yasyāno vā raho vāntarāgnī yāti*. The passage from TB. has not been adapted satisfactorily to the new JB. context as *sam . . careyuh* does not refer to chariots or carts. The ellipse of *agnin* in *yasyāntareṇa* is harsh.

⁸ *kurvīta haiva niṣkṛīm api heṣṭyā yajeta. tad u tathā na vidyād*. The first optatives, though occurring in a principal clause and not in apodosis, are used in the sense of a supposition. This use of the optative is more current than is assumed by Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 335. See also Gonda, *Character of the I. E. Moods*, p. 58 f; 60. Moreover the meaning of these so-called “potentiale Optative” is not uniform. Here e.g. *kurvīta* does not express a possibility which may or may not arise during a rite (“it may happen that. .”), but refers to a less recommendable alternative (“he may, if he wishes . . , but a better solution were . .”). The initial position of *kurvīta* stresses this verb-form and especially its optative aspect (“He may, indeed perform . .”).

⁹ Here *yuktam* (adv.) represents a reinterpretation of *yuktam* (noun) above.

¹⁰ Read with Oertel *vayāmsi samcaranti* instead of *vayāmsi ca caranti*.

¹¹ According to D. Schrapel, *Untersuchung der Partikel iva und anderer lexikalisch-syntaktischer Probleme der vedischen Prosa* . . (thesis Marburg 1970), p. 8 *amedhya* (the ŚB. version has *ajuṣṭa*-) should mean “unaromatic”.

¹² For *ēḍaka* Oertel's mss. read *ēḍakaḥ* with *ḥ* as usual in Jaiminīya texts (see Caland, JGS. ed., p. 10 f.).

¹³ Oertel's conjecture *sam iyeta* (mss. *sannejīyeta*) was rejected by Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 63, who remarks: “vielleicht liegt eine Form von *ejate* vor: *sann ej'* oder *samej'*”. Frenz, *Über die Verben im Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*, p. 2 observes: “Wie aus dem ŚB zu ersehen ist, muss es sich um ein Verb des Gehens handeln. Nach der 4. Klasse flektiert *√i* auch p. 31, 33, 32, 6” (the numbers refer to the crit. ed.), and translates the form by “lief”. But the unanimous evidence of the manuscripts points to *ej*- instead of *i*-. One may also compare ŚB. 3, 1, 3, 28 *agnir vai yonir yajñasya garbho dīkṣito 'ntareṇa vai yonim garbhāḥ samcarati sa yat sa tatṛ aijati tvat pari tvad ā vartate tasmād ime garbhā ejanti tvat pari tvad ā vartante tasmād asyaīṣa samcāro bhavati*. Whatever may be the correct reading, JB. apparently has replaced *samcāret* (ŚB.) by an optative of *ejati*.

¹⁴ In *chādīmuṣṭim* (Oertel: *cchādīm uṣṭim*) only the meaning of *muṣṭi*- is established (see Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 63). Probably *cchādī*- has to be derived from *chad*- “to cover” and denotes a material used for covering (ŚB. version: *bhasman*).

¹⁵ The sentence *gārhapatyād āhavanīyān ninayann *iyāt* (or: **ninayanīyāt*) has been inserted and transferred erroneously from below (where it precedes the same mantra) according to Oertel, o.c., p. 332, n. 10, who omits it. His argument that the reading *yanti* of two manuscripts (in the preceding clause) “would seem to indicate that the quotation *idam viṣṇur*, etc., followed immediately” sounds quite convincing. All the manuscripts used by Raghu Vira, however, read *yanti*. Undoubtedly the passage is corrupt since *ninayati* refers to the pouring out of water rather than to the scattering of ashes (which for that matter has already been expressed by *nivapanto*). On the other hand one should not omit the whole sentence, as Oertel has done, because the direction one must follow has to be described. Therefore read *nivapanto yanti gārhapatyād āhavanīyād idam viṣṇur* . . etc.

¹⁶ RV. 1, 22, 17.

¹⁷ *kṣipre paramāsān āvapṣyate* “he will soon scatter his last ashes” (Eggeling). I read *param āsān* (cf. Viśva-Bandhu Śāstrī, *A Vedic Word-Concordance* II referring s.v. *para*- and *āsa*- to ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 4) and take *param* with *kṣipre*. In the parallels of this stereotyped way of reasoning *kṣipre*, however, occurs without *param*. Notice the difference between the active *āvāpsīt* (the action of the unconcerned priest scattering ashes which without his knowledge turn out to be the ashes of the sacrificer's corpse) and the middle *āvapṣyate* (the scattering performed by a man who is concerned in his action: “soon he will know what it means to scatter ashes”). See Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 117 on this aspect of the middle voice.

¹⁸ *jyēṣṭhagrhyam rotsyati* “the chief's household will be wailing” (Eggeling). According to M.-W. *jyēṣṭhagrhyā*- means “the eldest member of a family” and *rotsyati* is the future of *rudh*- (cf. Whitney, *Roots*, s.v.), whereas *rudīṣyati* is the future of *rud*- “to wail”. See also ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 8 *kṣipre 'sya dviṣan bhrātṛvyo janīṣyate priyatamaṃ rotsyati*, where Eggeling, observing in a note that Harisvāmin takes *rotsyati* as from *rudh*- (*rodhena māraṇam lakṣyate*

māriṣyatīty arthaḥ), translates "... he (the Sacrificer) will weep for him who is dearest to him". Obviously *rotsyati* should be derived from *rudh-* meaning "to be deprived of", "to lose", originally "to drive away from oneself" or perhaps "to bring to ruin" (cf. Latin *perdere*; Greek ὀλλυμι). It is also interpreted in this way by most translators BĀU. 1, 4, 8 (*sa yo 'nyam ātmanaḥ priyaṁ bruvāṇaṁ brūyāt priyaṁ rotsyatītiśvaro ha tathaiva syād .. sa yo ātmānam eva priyaṁ upāste na hāsyā priyaṁ pramāyukaṁ bhavati*). The parallels prove that *rotsyati* is the opposite of *janiṣyate* (see also ŚB. 12, 5, 1, 17) and refers to loss and destruction (*pramāyuka-*). For the derivation from *rudh-* compare also TB. 1, 6, 5, 2; 3, 3, 3, 1 *priyaṁ jñātiṁ rundhyāt*.

¹⁹ According to AB. 6, 36, 11 verses to the purifying soma (*pāvamānyah*) are a *devapavitram*.

²⁰ Instead of *evainaṁ tac* read with ŚB. *evainat tac*.

53-54. The milk is spilt

For this second expiation see ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 6 ff.; 2, 6 ff. This source (in which, as in JB., the expiation for something passing between the fires directly precedes) retains the chronological order of the ritual in its expiations and consequently does not treat all the spilling expiations together. There are, moreover, some minor, but not insignificant, differences. According to ŚB. at every spilling the milk spilt should be touched and water must be poured out (the *prāyaścitti*). Thereafter one should offer *pariśiṣṭena* (respectively *yad anyad vindet tena; yat sthālyāṁ pariśiṣṭaṁ syāt tena*) (the *karman*). The *karman* in JB. agrees, but no *prāyaścitti* is prescribed in the case of a simple spilling and water is not poured out when the *sthāli* turns topsyturvy. ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 6 omitting details (e.g. the mantra, to which it only refers by *skannaprāyaścittena*) offers a short summary of the expiation with the necessary *karman* prescriptions. ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 7-8 dwells at length on the *prāyaścitti* aspect and distinguishes between the spilling as such (*atha yatra skannaṁ syāt*) and the breaking of the *sthāli* (*atha yatrābhabhinnaṁ syāt*), which forms an additional *prāyaścitti*. This clear-cut distinction between the two aspects of this expiation does not imply that *yatra .. tad* (at the beginning of ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 7 and 8) should be taken as "in case ... (then)" (Eggeling). For the purely local *yatra .. tad* compare JB. 1, 54 *yatrāha-vanīyasya bhasmodāhṛtaṁ syāt tad upanivapet; yatraiva skandet tad upaviśed* (= ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 8 *tad evopaviśed, tad eva* meaning "on the spot"); MS. 1, 8, 3: 118. 3 *yatra skandet tad apo ninayed* (Hoens, *Śānti*, p. 42 incorrectly renders "When it (the milk) is spilt, then he should pour down water"). Because of *yatra* and the context *tad* should have the sense of "there". For *tad* meaning "there" see also the last phrase of JB. 1, 46. Eggeling's translation, which seems to imply that *askannadhita prājani* is only recited when the milk is spilt (and not in case the pot breaks), creates an opposition between the spilling and the breaking. In fact, the breaking constitutes a special subdivision of the spilling expiation. One must touch the spilt milk (and recite the mantra) on every spot where the milk is spilt (even if the spilling is due to a crack). Water is poured out on the spot where the pot breaks as a means of expiation against the rupture. The composition of the JB. passage (in which the first *yatra .. tad* phrase is missing) seems to be less original. The *pratika* of the mantra *askannadhita* has been transferred to the first paragraph of 1, 53 and therefore the *brāhmaṇa* explanation *yadā vai skandaty atha dhīyate ..* etc. does not directly follow the mantra.

Another difference between the two *brāhmaṇas* arises in the expiation for the spilling of milk which is being taken to the *āhavanīya*. According to ŚB. milk is again ladled out at the *gārhapatya* and taken (in the *sruc*) to the priest. In the version of JB. the *sthāli* is taken to the performer and the milk is ladled out on the spot. The version of ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 8 seems

to have a better composition. In JB. *tad ada evāsyonnesyāmity uktam bhavati atha yathonnītam unnīya samīdham ādāya prāk preyāt* the adverb *adas* may be local ("there, at the gārhapatya"), but in ŚB., where the milk is ladled out again at the gārhapatya, it can only refer to a former occasion. For *adas* in connection with "une procédure déjà vue" see Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 191 a. The contrasting *atra* "here, now, on this occasion" (ŚB.) is ill spared in the JB. version. Moreover *tad* (before *adas*) is rather strange in the context. In the version of ŚB. it constantly refers to the milk: *tad asmā unnīyāhareyuh ... tad agnāv adhiśritya ... tad — ado haivonnesyāmity uktam bhavati ...* (parenthesis in a slightly anacoluthic sentence) *athātra yathonnītam evāsmā unnīyāhareyus tena kāmam juhuyāt*.

The expiation of this section has several parallels in other texts. A survey of these correspondences may be useful as some translations are not reliable. According to the oldest texts (KS. 6, 3; KapS. 4, 2; MS. 1, 8, 3) another pot should be used if the first breaks during the milking, and another cow should be milked for additional milk (*anyām abhiduhyāt*) in case the milk is spilt after the pot has been put on the fire. This is criticized by TB. 1, 4, 3, 4 (*yad abhiduhyāt arṇanārtam yajñasya samsrjet*). The YV. Saṃhitās further prescribe *yatra skandet tad apo ninayet*, a sentence which in KS. and KapS. concludes the expiation and is added as a general rule prescribing that at every spilling (and breaking of a vessel followed by spilling) water should be poured out on the spot where the milk has been spilt. In the apparently later MS. version it has been transferred to the beginning of the passage. That *yatra ... tad ...* here are used as adverbs with a local sense (see above for a different interpretation) appears also from MS. *yatra vā etā* (sc. *āpah*) *asyā upayanti tat praśastatārā ośadhayo jāyante*. For this pouring of water on the milk spilt see also TB. 1, 4, 3, 4 (spilling during milking) *apa upasrjati, adbhir evainad āpnoti*. The Śrautakośa I, p. 356 translates this passage (as quoted by BSS. 14, 23) "One should pour water (on the remaining milk). He, indeed, obtains it with water". See also Dumont, *Mélanges d'indianisme*, p. 246 "(Puis) l'adhvaryu verse de l'eau (sur ce qui reste de lait dans le pot). (En faisant cela) il obtient (c'est-à-dire récupère) par l'eau (le lait qui a été répandu)". In view of the YS. parallels (and ŚB./JB.) one may assume that water is poured on the milk spilt rather than on the rest of the milk. The milk in the pot is not replenished by water, but the spilt milk is recovered by means of water* (for the etymological magic *āpah* / *āpnoti* see ŚB. 1, 1, 1, 14 with Eggeling's note; cf. ParGS. 1, 3, 13), lest it should be lost for the sacrifice(r) and exercise its powerful influence in a wrong way. See Hoens, *Śānti*, p. 37, whose remarks are partly (the milk is not yet cooked here) also applicable to this passage.

The expiation of AB. 7, 5, 2 (*agnihotram adhiśritam skandati vā viśyandate vā*) prescribes that the milk spilt should be touched and water be poured out (cf. ŚB.). Keith renders *tad adbhir upaninayet* "He should pour water on it" (and seems to make "it" refer to the rest of the milk) and *athainad dakṣiṇena pāninābhimṛśya* "then he touches (the rest) with

his right hand". Apart from practical difficulties (the milk is very hot) one may object to this interpretation that AB. 7, 3, 4 (= 5, 27, 7; the spilling during milking) evidently states that the spilt milk should be touched (*sa yat tatra skandayet tad abhimṛśya*). Cf. also AthPr. 1, 3 (spilling during offering) *atha yatraivāvaskannam bhavati tam deśam abhivimṛjya ... ālabhya*. The meaning behind this touching seems to be that by this *contactus* one again transfers the (power of the) spilt sacrificial substance to the sacrifice. This touching and pouring of water is also found in ŚB., but JB. omits the pouring of water (pouring water when the pot has been broken has a different function). On the other hand AgnPr. 8 b (quoted by von Negelein, n. 711) prescribes (in case of a *viśyandanam*, cf. AB. 7, 5, 2) that water should be poured on the remaining milk: *adhiśritāvasthāyām payoyavāgādyaṅnihotraḍravavyaviśyamdanena yadāgniṃ prāpyate tadā sthāligataḍravayopary udakam upasimcet athainad dakṣiṇena pāninābhimṛśya ... etc.* (= AB.) ... *tataḥ sthāligatam apsu prakṣipet ... yadā bhūmiṃ prāpyate tadā ... āhavanīyasya bhasmamadhye prakṣipet*. Apparently this text does not (as AB.) combine the spilling and the boiling over. The latter seems to imply that the oblatory material is impure and should be thrown away. This passage seems to be a late adaptation of the AB. expiation and does not prove that *adbhir upaninayet* in AB. should refer to pouring water on the rest of the milk. Remarkably AthPr. 1, 5 (*yasyāgnihoṭram śrāpyamānam viśyandayet tad adbhir upaninayet tad anumantrayate prthivīm turīyam iti ...*) "one should pour water over the spilt milk ..." — tr. Śrautakośa I, p. 160) agrees with AB. 7, 5, 2, whereas AthPr. 4, 3 separates the expiation for the boiling over (*antahparidhideṣe ninayet*) from the spilling. If the latter takes place, "one should throw the milk into water" (Śrautakośa I, p. 157, translation of *samudram tvā prahinomīty apo ninīya*). Compare, however, AgnPr. 6 b (von Negelein, n. 714) *yāvat skannam tāvanmātram duṣṭam bhavati na pātragatam. samudram vaḥ prahinomi ... iti mantrena duṣṭasyābhimamtranābhimarsane tamtrena kuryāt tata apo bhyavahareyuh*; ĀsvPr. 3 b (von Negelein, o.c., n. 723) *atha dohanā-diprācīnaharanāt prāg yadī skanne samudram va iti ... japet. tad apsu prakṣipyā pātragataṣeṣena homaḥ*. The same passage states that if the milk is spilt after being ladled out, one should touch this spilt milk (with a different mantra) and throw it into the water (*abhimṛśya apsu prakṣipyā*). If the remainder of the milk is sufficient for an oblation, one offers this or ladles out anew. The spilt milk (which may be regarded as impure) was originally thrown into water (and not all the milk). On the other hand BrahṃPr. 41 b (quoted by von Negelein, n. 724 together with another passage on throwing into water) *samudram vaḥ prahinomīty anena mantrenāpa upaninīya nīcau* (r. *nīcair*) *dravyam prāpyam yatra skandet tad apo ninayed iti brāhmaṇam* seems to refer to pouring water on the milk spilt, which thereby can be obtained back (*prāpyam*; cf. TB. *āpnoti*). Moreover the mantra *samudram vaḥ prahinomi* (AV. 10, 5, 23; the Paipp. read *upasrjāmi*; cf. TB. *apa upasrjati*) is only used in the ritual if water is poured out. The plural *vaḥ* refers to the plural *āpah*. The younger Taitt. (BhārṢS. 9, 7, 5; ĀpṢS. 9, 5, 6) use the same

mantra in connection with pouring water on the spilt milk (*adbhir upasrj-*, *upanī-*; see Caland's translation of Āp.; Kashikar's wrong rendering of Bhār. has been corrected in the Errata).

One may conclude that the mantra *samudraṃ vaḥ prahinomi* in the post-brāhmaṇa period sometimes was used for pouring water on the spilt milk. Some late texts retain the mantra but change the expiation by throwing the spilt (= impure) milk into water. Sometimes even all the milk is thrown away. AthPr. has adapted the mantra to its new function by changing *vaḥ* (the waters) into *tvā* (the oblation). One of the starting-points for this change may have been a misinterpretation of the acc. *apah* (object, but interpreted as an acc. of goal). This would imply that texts, rather than ritual practices, were transmitted and borrowed.

Of special importance is the spilling of the milk after it has been ladled out and taken to the āhavanīya. In the YV. Saṃhitās the priest returns to the gārhapatya (a point which is criticized in most later texts), pours the rest back into the *sthālī* and another cow is milked upon it (criticized by TB., see above). AB. 7, 5, 6 states *sa yady upanivartayet svargāl lokād yajamānam āvartayet atraivāsmā upaviṣṭāyaitam agnihotrapariṣeṣam āhareyuh* (cf. JB.). Since the āhavanīya represents heaven and the oblation the sacrificer himself (who offers for himself a new body, a new existence in yonder world, i.e. he offers himself), returning from the āhavanīya with the oblation means turning back the sacrificer from heaven. TB. 1, 4, 3, 5 considers the return to be a cleavage of the sacrifice and further agrees with AB.: *yatra skandet tan niṣadya punar grhṇīyāt yatraiva skandati tata evainat punar grhṇāti*. Dumont's translation of *niṣadya* "après avoir déposé (le pot d'où l'on a puisé le lait)" (o.c., p. 246) is untenable (correct: *Śrautakośa* I, p. 166 "one should sit down"). Here JB. agrees with TB. and AB., whereas ŚB. prescribes that the milk should be ladled out at the gārhapatya and brought to the sitting officiant (explicitly rejected by AgnPr. 7 b; see von Negelein, n. 49: *tatraivopaviṣṭa unnayet na svayam srug vā pratyag gachet*). JB. does not just copy ŚB.; sometimes it consults the sources and predecessors of ŚB. For the criticism of the return to the gārhapatya see also AthPr. 1, 3 (evidently based on AB.). It is worth mentioning that ŚB. agrees especially with AB.: touching of the spilt milk; *upaninayet* / *upaninīya* (AB./ŚB.); no second expiatory milking and offering; *svargāl lokād yajamānam āvartayet* / *prati nvā ayam svargāl lokād avāruḥṣat* (AB./ŚB.); *yathonnīti* / *yathonnītam* (AB./ŚB.), etc. JB. borrowing this passage from ŚB. seems to be influenced by TB.: *uddrutasya* / *prāca uddrutasya* (TB./JB.); the ladling out by the seated priest himself (occurring, however, also in AB.). The fact that JB. 2, 41 deals with a different spilling expiation (*tasmād yad agnihotrasya vājyasya vāvaskandet tad abhimrśed bhūpataye svāhā bhūvanapataye svāhā bhūtānām pataye svāheti*) supports the assumption that the *prāyaścittis* in the agnihotra section (and presumably the whole agnihotra section itself) form a later addition.

As for the relation between the other texts one may note that KS. 6, 3 (= KapS. 4, 2) and MS. 1, 8, 3 agree very closely. The latter passage

because of its composition and some additions gives the impression that it is the younger version. The relation between the two brāhmaṇas TB. and AB. (which both argue against the YV. Saṃhitās) is obscure in this passage. AB. 7, 5, 2-7 scarcely resembles TB. (which does not mention the spilling of milk put on the fire and the breaking of the ladle). Only AB. 7, 5, 6 to some extent agrees with TB. 1, 4, 3, 6 (*uddrutasya skandet*). AB. 7, 3, 7 (= 5, 27, 7) deals with the spilling during the milking and shows some striking agreements with TB. 1, 4, 3, 4 (there are more agreements between AB. 5, 27 and TB. 1, 4, 3). The expiations of AB. 5, 27 and 7, 2 ff. apparently belong to different levels of the texts. Similarly TB. has a double treatment of the expiations: 1, 4, 3-4 and 3, 7, 1-3 (the spilling expiation 3, 7, 2 is based on KS. 35, 19). Among the sūtras as usual Baudh. strictly follows the own brāhmaṇa. The younger Taitt. accept practices which had been rejected by TB. These younger Taitt. agree with ĀśvŚS. and MŚS. on some points, e.g. the use of the mantra *samudraṃ vaḥ prahinomi* (see *Śrautakośa* I, English Section, p. 157; 167 f. for the spilling).

On the meaning of this expiation see Hoens, *Śānti*, p. 41 f., whose interpretation only concerns the *śānti* aspect. It may, however, be questioned whether the spilling or boiling over of the milk implies that "there is an evil power in the milk, which will cause the sacrifice to fail. Water extinguishes the blaze of the evil power" (o.c., p. 41) and whether in case the implements break there is an "inimical power in the sacrifice, which becomes manifest in the crack" (p. 43). Water may (especially in connection with the conception of *śānti*) have the function of extinguishing something dangerous, but the assumption of inimical powers which influence the sacrifice seems to be debatable. One might as well posit that the most important factors for an expiation are the failure or accident as such and its possible, evil results rather than the cause of the accident (e.g. an evil, inimical power). Expiations are made for (what we should call) ethical trespasses, unconscious mistakes, ritual faults due to the officiant himself or to external circumstances etc. without any distinction. The accident itself, i.e. the spilling, is essential. No human being is blamed for it and no evil power forms the cause of the accident. Since the sacrifice is an operation which sets going a process with cosmic potencies to the benefit of the sacrificer, every failure should be expiated and, if possible, be undone. It may affect the sacrificer's welfare (the milk represents his life or his body) and therefore TB. tries to obtain or get back the lost milk by pouring water on it (*āpah* / *āpnoti*). Moreover the result of the accident, i.e. the fact that spilt milk is lying on the earth, may be regarded as dangerous. That milk is not (or does not contain) an evil power; it is identical with the milk in the *sthālī*. The difference is that the spilt milk (which no longer forms a part of the oblation and does not contribute to the success of the rite) may have evil influence as an uncontrollable power if it is not neutralized. Belonging to the sacrificer's life and body (oblation = sacrificer) it is as dangerous as nails or hairs carelessly thrown away. By pouring water on it the lost, powerful material is extinguished, eliminated,

neutralized (see also Hoens, o.c., p. 37). Pouring water on the broken pot means restoring the wholeness of that implement, rather than expelling evil, inimical powers which would have caused the crack or manifest themselves in that fissure. It is explicitly stated that an *udapātram*, *udasthālī* or *udakamaṇḍalu* should be poured out. This means that by one, uninterrupted jet of water the scattered pieces of the broken pot are again connected and the broken continuity is restored (just as in the expiation of JB. 1, 52 for the passing of something between the fires). The function of the water is completely different from the one it had when it was poured on the spilt milk.

53. Now they say: "If the agnihotra milk of this performer of a long sacrificial session, viz. the offerer of the agnihotra, should be spilt while being milked out, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Whatever may be left in the pot, with that he should offer. "If, however, the pot should be turned topsyturvy or if it should break, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Having touched (the spilt milk) with the expiatory formula for spilling "There has been spilt, there has been conceived" he should offer with what else he may obtain.

When there is spilt (effused, emitted), then there is conceived.¹ Now the milk is seed and this (earth) a womb.² Thus he places seed in a womb. For him³ who knows thus seed which has been shed does not fail⁴ to be born forth.² From yonder world rain (*parjanya*) is shed (and) here (on earth) herbs and trees are produced. From man seed is shed (*skandati*), from animals (it is shed), (and) therefrom all here (that lives) is born. He should consider: "The gods have come to my aid.⁵ My generative power has been increased.⁶ I shall become more prosperous." (And) this would come to pass so.

And where this breaking (of the pot) takes place, there he should pour out a water-pot or a water-jar on it with these utterances: "*bhūr bhuvas svar*". Now these utterances are expiations for all.⁷ So with this All he makes expiation.⁸

54. Then, having collected⁹ these potsherds, he should throw them away on the spot where the ashes from the āhavanīya are removed. This is the rite (performed) in that case.

Now further they say: "If there should be spilt of the milk with which the officiant has moved to the east¹⁰ (i.e. to the āhavanīya), what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Whatever may be left in the ladle, with that he should offer. "And if the ladle should be turned topsyturvy, or if it should break, what rite

and what expiation would there be in that case?" The touching (expiation) for this has been treated.

Now there are also some people who return (to the gārhapatyā) and ladle out (again). He should not do it thus. If any one should say in that case: "What he wished to achieve by that agnihotra, from that he has turned back. Therefore this (agnihotra) will not be conducive to heaven for him", it would indeed come to pass so.

He should proceed thus: where there is spilt, there he should sit down. They should bring him the pot and the *sruva* and *sruc* after having cleansed them. At that time (i.e. when the milk was first ladled out) there was said: "I shall ladle out" by him, but (now) he should (only) ladle out in the usual way (without a formula), take a firewood and go eastward (to the āhavanīya). As one may take strong action against one's enemies and finish them,¹¹ so he dispels the evil consisting of absence of subsistence and accomplishes the sacrifice. Some, however, seize (him) so to say (i.e. censure him)¹² on this point, saying: "There has not been offered by (or: for) him, for whom they offer with the remainder of the agnihotra milk. For this has been discarded". He should, however, not consider it thus. When that (remaining milk) is not discarded, they make it rennet for an oblation.¹³

NOTES

¹ *yadā vai skandaty atha dhiyate*. The double meaning of *skandati* "to spill"/"to emit seed" is utilized for this expiation. TB. 3, 7, 10, 3 f. bases its *ekakapālaskannaprāyaścitti* on a similar "wordplay" of *skandati* meaning "to be spilt" and "to leap, cover": *askān dyauḥ prthivīm askān ṛṣabho yuvā gāḥ skannemā viśvā bhuvanā skanno yajñāḥ prajānayatū askān ajani prājani āskannāj jāyate ṛṣā skannāt prajāniṣimahi*. Compare the mantra *askannadhita prājani* in the ŚB. version of the present section. The fact that JB. omits *prājani* is not a strict proof that it has borrowed from ŚB., but again forms one of the many indications. See Caland, *Over en uit het JB.*, p. 36, n. 47.

² *yonyām evaitad retaḥ pratiṣṭhāpayaty anuṣṭhyāsyā retas siktam prajāyate ya evaṃ veda*. Cf. JB. 3, 115 *yonir vai yajñasya cātūlaṃ reta āpo yonyām evaitad retaḥ* . . etc. The wording in both JB. passages corresponds completely. ŚB. differs on some points (e.g. *yonau*). Since the expiations are evidently borrowed from ŚB. and presumably belong to a late stage of JB., one may assume that these stock phrases were current in the circles of ŚB. as well as JB.

³ *asya* here is a *genitivus pro dativo* ("to the benefit of", "for"). The seed which develops into offspring is not only his own seed, but includes all kinds of seed: rain, seed of animals etc. The spilling brings about (for him who knows thus) an increase of fertility in vegetation and procreation. The spilling though being unintentional is now turned into a magic rite producing

rain (principle of *similia similibus*) followed by vegetation and the emission of seed ("etymological" magic) followed by procreation.

⁴ Eggeling translates *anuṣṭhyā* by "forthwith" (cf. Caland, *Auswahl*, p. 250 "sofort"). I reserve a detailed discussion of this term (which occurs also JB. 1, 8) for another occasion.

⁵ The clause *upa mā devāḥ prābhūvan* does not occur in the ŚB. version, but is found ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 10 (rain falling on milk), where (unlike the present situation) it refers to an interference with the rite from outside by the gods, who send prosperity (in the form of rain) from above upon (*upa*) the sacrificer and thereby come near to him; help him (*upaprabhū-*). Apparently JB. has mixed up two *prāyaścittis*, viz. the expiation for the spilling, which will (fut.!) produce rain and fertility, and the one for the falling of rain, in which the rain has fallen and the gods have already shown their aid (*upa ... prābhūvan*, an aorist referring to the immediate past).

⁶ *bhūyasī me prajātir abhūd ...* (with a different word order in JB.) "(let him therefore know that) abundant production has accrued to him" (Eggeling). I take *abhūt* as a copula and *prajāti-* as "generative power, productivity", which refers to the potential, future production of sons, cattle and crop.

⁷ *etā vai vyāhṛtayas sarvapṛāyaścittayaḥ* (ŚB. — *ih*) "for these utterances are all-expiatory" (Eggeling, who observes in a note: "Or, perhaps, — these (great) utterances are used with the 'Sarvapṛāyaścittam' (libation for expiating every mistake)". The compound has to be analysed as a tatpuruṣa: "expiations for all". Compare ṢaḍvB. 1, 6, 11 ff., where the mahāvyaḥṛtis are identical with the *sarvapṛāyaścittam*. See also AB. 5, 32, 6 *saiśā sarvapṛāyaścittir yad etā vyāhṛtayaḥ*; JUB. 3, 4, 3, 3 *etā vai vyāhṛtayas sarvapṛāyaścittayaḥ*. For a correct interpretation one has to consider the meaning of *sarva-* and the function of the *sarvapṛāyaścitti*. For *sarva-* referring to the undivided whole, to completeness, etc. see Gonda, *Indian Linguistics* 16 (1955) (= *Chatterji Jubilee Vol.*), p. 53 ff. The expiation does not, as some translators take it, concern everything (since for every particular mistake a particular expiation exists), but the indistinct totality. In case of doubt whether the error refers to *ṛc*, *yajus* or *sāman*, one uses the three *vyāhṛtis* as a means of expiation for "all without distinction" (AB. 5, 32, 5 f.; ŚB. 11, 5, 8, 6; JB. 1, 358; ṢaḍvB. 1, 6, 17 (cf. 1, 5, 8); JUB. 3, 4, 3, 1 ff.; ChU. 4, 17, 4 ff.). For this indefiniteness expressed by *sarva-* see also ŚSS. 3, 19, 8 *tatrobhe kuryāt sarvapṛāyaścittam cādḥikārikam ca* "he should perform both: the general atonement as well as the specially enjoined one" (tr. Caland). In the present context (the breaking of the *śihālī*) the *vyāhṛtis* representing the most perfect completeness, the three worlds, the universe, are supposed to restore the completeness, soundness, wholeness of the broken pot. Therefore the text continues *tad anena sarveṇa pṛāyaścittim kurute*. One expects, however, before *tad anena sarveṇa* an equation with (*idam*) *sarvam* like ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 1 *sarvam vāsaniruktam tad anena sarveṇa pṛāyaścittim kurute*. Cf. ŚB. 12, 8, 3, 18 *etā vai vyāhṛtaya idam sarvam tad enam anena sarveṇābhihiṣāncāma iti*. The equation required here would be *vyāhṛtis = idam sarvam*.

⁸ *tad anena sarveṇa pṛāyaścittim kurute* "he thus makes expiation with all this (Universe)" (Eggeling). How are we to understand this expiation by means of the Universe and what is the meaning of *idam sarvam*? Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 91 a takes *idam* as an adverb ("tout ici-bas"). See also o.c., § 119 c "La disjonction *idam ... sarvam* confirme que le démonstratif est adverbe"; § 388 a (referring to ŚB. 7, 4, 1, 6 *tasmād yadāivāpo yanti athedam sarvam jāyate yad idam kim ca*) "La reprise de *idam* en écho confirme qu'il est adverbe". However, the occurrence of *idam sarvam* in declined forms has

modified his view. See o.c. II, § 300 a "Le loc. *asmin ... sarvasmin* prouve que, dans une partie au moins de ses ex., la sequence *idam sarvam* doit s'entendre "ce Tout" (= le monde entier, l'univers)". His arguments are not convincing, as may appear from ŚB. 7, 4, 1, 25 *anena sarveṇa ... yad idam kim ca*, where according to Minard's criterions the repetition would imply an adverb and the occurrence of a declined form indicate a pronoun. Like *ayam* (cf. *ayam janah* "this people, people here") *idam*, though being a congruent pronoun and, as such, declinable (*asmin sarvasmin* "in all this, in all here"), may be translated by an adverb in modern languages. The problem relates to *sarvam* rather than to *idam*. This term may refer to the All, the Universe, or to all, everything (to be regarded as the totality of all things) in other words the article is implied (German "das All") or not (German "alles"). In the first case *idam* brings out the implied article (Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 209) and *idam sarvam* seems to denote "the All". It is represented as lying within the sphere or mental horizon of the speaker. Being the absolute totality *idam sarvam* removes the antithesis of this (*ayam*) and yonder (*asau*) world. Similarly *idam* (adverb, "here") in cosmogonic passages does not refer exclusively to this sublunary world, but to the whole universe, within which the cosmos, as we know it now (*idam*), is coming into existence. In the second case (*sarvam* = "all") *idam* at first sight seems to refer to the terrestrial sphere: "all this, all here (on earth)" (i.e. *sarvam* does not seem to have a cosmic meaning). Compare ŚB. 7, 4, 1, 6 *idam sarvam ... yad idam kim ca* to AB. 1, 29, 4 *idam ... sarvam havir yad idam kim ca*, and ŚB. 1, 3, 2, 16 *iyām* (sc. the earth) *vā anuṣṭubh asyai vā idam sarvam* to 1, 9, 3, 12 *asyām hīdam sarvam pratiṣṭhitam*. But *idam* does not always limit the sphere of *sarvam* to the earth, as appears from ŚB. 1, 1, 3, 4 *vr̥tro ha vā idam sarvam vṛtvā śiṣye yad idam antareṇa dyāvāpṛthivī sa yad idam sarvam vṛtvā śiṣye tasmād vṛtro nāma*. Apparently *idam sarvam* was not a fixed, philosophical concept or special term for the universe in the brāhmaṇas. The difference between "all this" and "this All" seems to be only gradual. Often (*idam*) *sarvam* denotes a totality which covers a limited sphere and which varies according to the contexts. Sometimes it refers to the terrestrial sphere, sometimes to special facets of, or domains in, this sphere — ŚāṅkhB. 3, 4 "in the spring all this is kindled" (vegetable kingdom); ŚB. 1, 9, 1, 28 *etāvad vā idam sarvam yāvad dvīpāc caiva catuṣpāc ca* (animal-kingdom and human beings) —, sometimes it covers such a complete totality as to coincide with our modern notion of the universe (ŚB. 12, 8, 3, 18 *idam sarvam* = the three *vyāhṛtis* = the three worlds = the Universe; ŚB. 2, 1, 4, 11 *etāvad vā idam sarvam yāvad ime lokāḥ*). Therefore (*idam*) *sarvam* should neither invariably be translated by "the All, that All, the Universe" nor by "all this, all here". The less rigid approach, however, involves the risk of inconsistencies. Eggeling e.g. alternates "the All" with "everything" in similar contexts. For that matter, the latter translation should be avoided (see Gonda, *Indian Linguistics* 16, p. 64). Not the details as expressed by "everything", but the completeness of "all" is meant by *sarvam*. There seems to be a striving for totality or completeness in the brāhmaṇas: a complete life-time (not: long life), a complete sacrifice, etc. (see also Gonda, o.c., *passim*). This tendency is not only found in striving for deliverance (to become *sarvam*, to be freed from the limitations of the transitory individual; to obtain *sarvam*, to obtain the quarters of the universe and the year, i.e. to become one with the totality of space and time), but also in the ritualistic sphere with which we are concerned here. As was observed in the preceding note, *anena sarveṇa* should be based on the equation *vyāhṛtis = idam sarvam* (replaced by *sarvapṛāyaścittayaḥ*), the usual pattern

being: "x = (*idam*) *sarvam*, so by means of (*idam*) *sarvam* he performs this or that action". These stereotyped phrases are almost confined to ŚB. Only the phrase "x = *sarvam* (y = *sarvam*), so by *sarvam* he reaches *sarvam*" occurs six times in ŚāṅkhB. and once in GB. One may compare also GB. 2, 1, 3 *bṛhaspatir vai sarvaṁ brahma sarveṇa ha vā etad brahmaṇā* ("by the whole brahman") *yajñam dakṣiṇata udyacchate*. It is striking that these phrases do not seem to be current in JB. as was shown in samples which I have taken from this text (there is no complete concordance). Once more evidence for borrowing from ŚB.?

For establishing the meaning of *anena sarveṇa* in these phrases three points may give a clue: a) the underlying identifications; b) the verbs of the contexts; c) parallel constructions. Point b) does not yield much information. No homogeneity of the verbs is demonstrable. Any kind of (ritual) action can be performed *anena sarveṇa*. As to point a) one may especially note identifications of *sarvam* with *aniruktam* and *pūrṇam* (i.e. the indistinct completeness) and two or three times with *soma*, *saṁvatsara*, *sahasram* and *viśve devāḥ* (all symbolizing totality), whereas Prajāpati and other items are equated only once. With *idam sarvam* the texts homologize *madhu* twice and the *vyāhṛtis* once. Furthermore *sarveṇa* sometimes occurs without a preceding equation or after the phrase *etāvad vā idam* (sic) *sarvaṁ yāvad ime lokāḥ*, resp. *yāvad brahma kṣatram viṭ*, etc. On the other hand *anena sarveṇa* is based once (ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 1) on an identification without *idam* (viz. *sarvaṁ vā aniruktam*). So the instrumentals *sarveṇa* and *anena sarveṇa* seem to be used without much difference. The *viśve devāḥ* are equated with *sarvam* (ŚB. 1, 7, 4, 22) as well as with *idam sarvam* (ŚB. 3, 9, 1, 14). In these stereotyped phrases one has to reject the variety of meanings given by Eggeling which range from "with the Universe" to "with everything (required)". The underlying equations point to completeness, indistinct or undivided wholeness, totality. As to point c) one may compare ŚB. 1, 9, 3, 3 *sarvaṁ vai pūrṇam sarveṇaivainam etad chamayati* ("by means of the All", tr. Eggeling) to i.c. *saṁtatam avyavachinnam ninayati saṁtatenaivainam etad avyavachinnena samayati* ("in a continuous, uninterrupted manner", tr. Eggeling). The occurrence of *anena sarveṇa* in the parallels preventing us from interpreting *sarveṇa* as "in a complete manner, completely", we have to translate for the sake of consistency *saṁtatena* "by means of the continuous, with continuity". That *sarveṇa* somehow refers to completeness, undivided wholeness, etc. seems to be beyond doubt here. Compare also ŚB. 1, 4, 1, 21 *sarvaṁ vā aniruktam sarveṇaivaitad pratipadyate* to ŚB. 2, 3, 4, 9 *tad akṣayyeṇaivaitad bhūmnā pratipadyate* (pointing to fullness, completeness). To ŚB. 1, 7, 4, 22 (*sarvam* = *viśve devāḥ*) and 1, 9, 3, 5 (*sarvam* = *pūrṇam*) *sarveṇaivaitad saṁdadhāti* corresponds ŚB. 6, 4, 3, 1 ff. *yad vā asyai kṣatam yad viliṣtam adbhir/vayunā/digbhir tat saṁdhiyate adbhir/vayunā/digbhir evāsyā etad kṣatam viliṣtam saṁtanoti saṁdadhāti*. So *sarveṇa* may refer to a concrete embodiment of the idea of completeness or wholeness (cf. *digbhiḥ*, the totality of space): the Whole, the All, the Universe. Eggeling translates ŚB. 1, 9, 3, 3 (*sarvam* = *pūrṇam*) and 2, 2, 1, 3 (*sarvam* = *aniruktam*) the instr. "by means of (with) the All", but ŚB. 2, 2, 1, 4 (*sarvam* = *varaḥ* "boon") in the same phrase (*sarveṇaivainam etad chamayati*) "with everything". Cf. ŚB. 9, 1, 2, 2 *yāvān agnir yāvaty asya mātṛā tāvataivainam etad chamayati* (Agni's *mātṛā* is the universe). In these stock phrases the meaning of (*anena*) *sarveṇa* constantly seems to be the same ("the All, Completeness, Totality represented by the Universe"). The connotation of *sarvam* in the underlying equations may vary in accordance with the equated entities ("all this, all

here, the All"). Compare the parallel stock phrase "x = *agnir yāvān agnir yāvaty asya mātṛā tāvata* he performs this or that action". In this instance the equation may refer to every kind of *agni* according to the equated entity, whereas in the conclusion only the *mātṛā* of the omnipresent Agni (i.e. the universe) is mentioned. In the ritualistic expositions of the brāhmaṇas every ritual action is placed in a cosmic perspective, which implies that every part or ingredient of the sacrifice should be proved to be equal with the totality to which it belongs. One makes amends to Agni with all metres (ŚB. 9, 5, 1, 53). "So great is the extension of the metre; verily thus with the whole extension of the metre he gives oblation" (ŚāṅkhB. 3, 5 — tr. Keith). One gratifies Agni with all food: "that udumbara tree, indeed, (being) all the trees, is all food: he thus gratifies him (Agni) by every kind of food and kindles him by all trees (kinds of wood)" (ŚB. 6, 6, 3, 3 — tr. Eggeling), etc. etc. Eggeling's rendering "every kind of food" should be corrected into "all food". Cf. ŚB. 7, 2, 3, 3, *sarveṇaivāsminn etad annam* (thus should be read instead of *anne*) *dadhāti*; 7, 2, 2, 15 *yāvān agnir yāvaty asya mātṛā tāvataivāsminn etad annam dadhāti*. Putting food in somebody "with the All, the Whole, the Universe" means putting the complete totality of food which is found in the Universe in him. Cf. ŚB. 7, 2, 2, 13 *tad yac catasṛṣu dikṣv annam tad asminn etad dadhāti*. That "all food" and not "every kind of food" is meant, confirms ŚB. 7, 2, 4, 25 *virād u kṛtsnam annam sarvam evāsminn etad kṛtsnam annam dadhāti* "The Virāj is equal to the entire food; the whole, entire food he thereby places in him".

This striving for completeness is not restricted to equations with all metres, all food, etc., or to equations with the All regarded as the reservoir of all food; it may even culminate in a tendency to obtain by means of equations the All, the Universe, as the most suitable instrument for a complete (= successful) ritual action. See ŚB. 7, 2, 3, 4 *sarvasyo asyaṣa raso yad ājyam . . asyaivainam etad sarvasya raseṇa prīṇāti yāvān u vai rasas tāvān ātmāneṇaivainam etad sarveṇa prīṇāti*, where *anena sarveṇa* seems to denote the All, the Universe. At the agnicayana this pursuing of completeness by means of the All is also manifest (ŚB. 10, 2, 1, 11). Thousand bricks are laid down. Thousand means all, thus with the All (i.e. with the utmost completeness embodied in the Universe, and hardly "with everything (required)", Eggeling's interpretation) one confers that highest form on Agni. There are three rows of bricks, Agni is threefold, thus one bestows that highest form on him with the *mātṛā* of Agni (i.e. the All, the Universe, which forms Agni's *mātṛā*). Eggeling removes the *anena sarveṇa* phrase in his translation of ŚB. 9, 3, 4, 17 *vā vai sarasvatī tasyā idam sarvaṁ yantram savitṛprasūta evainam etad anena sarveṇa sarasvatyai vāco yantur yantrenāgneḥ sāmṛāṇyēnābhīṣīṇcati* "for Sarasvatī is Vāc (speech), and hers in all this support. Impelled by Savitṛ he thus anoints him by all this support of Sarasvatī Vāc, the supporter, and by the universal sovereignty of Agni". Evidently the *yantram* of Sarasvatī is equated with *idam sarvam* ("all here" or rather "this All") on account of the equation *Sarasvatī* = Vāc. Therefore *yantreṇa* stands in apposition to *anena sarveṇa* ("with the All") just as *yantur* to *vāco*. Cf. ŚB. 12, 8, 3, 18 *etā vai vyāhṛtaya idam sarvaṁ tad enam anena sarveṇ ābhīṣīcāma iti*. The turn of phrase *sarveṇaivam tat sarvam āpnoti* (ŚB. 10, 2, 5, 16) does not have a profane meaning ("by means of everything he thus gains everything" — tr. Eggeling), but refers to obtaining the All (becoming or obtaining the totality of space or time, the year, means becoming complete and escaping death; see Gonda, o.c., p. 69) by means of the All, the Universe, Completeness itself. Cf. JB. 3, 318 *sa* (sc. Prajāpati) *etam vyāptim vyāpnot*

idam sarvaṃ abhavat etam eva vyāptim vyāpnotīdam sarvaṃ bhavati ya evaṃ veda. That besides the conception of completeness and totality (for which see Gonda, o.c.) incidentally also the idea of "sound, whole in body, unhurt" (Gonda, o.c., p. 69) may play a role, appears from the present passage as well as from ŚB. 14, 3, 2, 2 *sarvaṃ vai pūrṇaṃ sarveṇaivaitad bhiṣajyati yat kiṃ ca viṣṭhāṃ yaññasya.*

⁹ For *saṃcintya* read with Oertel and ŚB. *saṃcitya.*

¹⁰ *prāca uddrutasya* must refer to the milk though in fact the officiant is walking to the east. Cf. JB. 1, 21 *upasyṣṭam* (the milk while the cow and the calf are brought together) and *prakrāntam* (when the officiant has set out towards the āhavanīya; = *uddrutam*). For *skandati* with a *gen. partit.* see Oertel, *Syntax of Cases*, p. 128. Since the construction is not a *gen. abs.*, Caland's translation ApSS. 9, 6, 1 *yady uddrutasya skandet* "Wenn die Milch übergeschüttet wird, nachdem er (n.l. der Adhvaryu oder wer immer das Agnihotra verrichtet) sich damit zum Āhavanīya hinbegeben hat" is confusing. For the absolute construction the loc. is used JB. 1, 57, where *uddrute* refers either to the priest or to the milk (cf. *adhiśrite*).

¹¹ Instead of *tad yathā pratyutthāyāmitrān* paced Oertel (observing: "the conjecture is only a makeshift") reads ... *mitrān* (thus his mss. and *ya, va, sa*) *vaded* ("perhaps viced?"). All the mss. read *paced* and this conjecture hardly makes sense. Consequently I retain the text of the critical edition. AB. 2, 20, 15 (to which Oertel refers) has *pratyuttiṣṭhati* with an acc. (*prati vai śreyāṃsam āyantam uttiṣṭhanti*), which might point to *mitrān* as the correct reading. Since the interpretation "As one might rise to meet friends and cook (them a meal)" would make a strange comparison, I take *pacati* here as "to bring to an end, to annihilate". Cf. Johnston, *The Buddhacarita* II (Calcutta 1936), p. 205, n. 16 (*vipacyate* "to come to an end"). The meaning of *pratyutthā-* may be either "to rise to meet (in battle)" or "to rise again". For *pratyutthā-* in the context of hostilities compare JB. 1, 179 (*Auswahl*, p. 70) *tān asurān etair evokthaiḥ pratyudatiṣṭhan* "Die Götter .. traten mit diesen Ukthas gegen die Asuras auf" (Caland) and JB. 3, 123 *kṛṣṇasarpa u haivainām pratyuttasthau* "Da erhob sich vor ihr eine schwarze Cobra" (Caland, *Auswahl*, p. 254), on which Ghosh, *Lost Brāhmaṇas*, p. 31 n. 11 observes that the verb *pratyutthā-* ("to rise for somebody") "is used here in inimical sense. Otherwise it signifies friendly greeting". The comparison seems to be: As in a battle one may get up (again) for a fresh attack on the enemies and destroy them in spite of an initial repulse, so the officiant gets up from his sitting position after the reverse (the spilling) and destroys the "spilling-enemy" (= *avṛttim pāpmānam*, spilling magically implying the loss of all food) and obtains a complete victory (= *āhutam prāpnoti*).

¹² Does *iva* ("so to say") in *upeva labhante* indicate that *upalabh-* here is used in an unusual sense? On account of the parallel version of ŚB. (*upavalhante* "some perplex him" — E.) and the context the meaning required here seems to be (as in classical Sanskrit) "to find fault with, to criticize, abuse, attack, take a firm line with".

¹³ See VādhS. 4, 38 (A.O. 6, p. 150) *agnihotrocchiṣṭam ātacya nidadhyāt; tan mathitvā dīkṣāṇīyasyājye 'pikuryād* "Er lasse den Rest des Agnihotra (d.h. der für das A. bestimmten Milch) gerinnen und bewahre diesen auf; dann quirle er (am folgenden Tag) diesen Rest und tue ihn zu der Butter für die Dīkṣāṇīya-īṣṭi" (Caland).

55-56. Something impure or rain falls on the milk

For this third expiation compare especially ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 2-4; 9-10. As to the relation between the two parallels one may first notice that the ŚB. version (*tad dhutam ahutam*) of the JB. clause *tan na hutam nāhutam* is not found throughout the whole passage, but occurs only in connection with the pouring of the polluted milk on the coals (ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 4). The fact that JB. explains this clause only at the end of 1, 55 (the parallel of ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 4) points to borrowing from ŚB. The latter text has *juhuyād* in the mentioned passage (against *ninayed* in the other paragraphs), whereas here JB. again equalizes the whole borrowed section by reading *ninayed* everywhere.

Instead of *teṣv evainat tūṣṇīm ninayet* (JB. 1, 55, second paragraph) ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 3 reads *tasminn enad uṣṇe bhasmaṃ tūṣṇīm ninayed*. One might explain the ŚB. version as an incorrect, careless repetition of the preceding paragraph (in which is stated that hot cinders are shifted out of the fire). On the other hand the JB. version, in which *teṣv* refers to the coals which just have been pushed back into the fire, would imply that the milk is offered in the (gārhapatya) fire. So presumably the ŚB. version is more original and one should assume that the pushing back of the coals leaves behind some hot cinders.

The ŚB. passage on the defilement of the milk which has been put on the fire (12, 4, 2, 4) differs from the preceding expiations on several points (*tān pratyūhya* is omitted; *tasminn enad uṣṇe bhasman* replaced by *teṣv enat*; *ninayet* replaced by *juhuyāt*; *tad dhutam ahutam* occurs only here). The JB. version hardly makes any distinction in respect to the other prāyaścittis dealing with the pollution. Replacing *dugdham* by *adhiśritam* and *adhiśrayiṣyan* by *adhiśritam* it repeats the whole preceding passage word for word. This does not only indicate that JB. has borrowed from ŚB. (as was observed above), but also that the borrowing and adaptation was made rather automatically. One may regard e.g. *tān eva pratyūhya* as a thoughtless repetition from the preceding passage since the pushing back of the coals is hardly compatible with the statement *yad v enāns teno evānugamayati* .. (coals pushed back into the fire are not extinguished by a milk offering). Moreover pushing back the coals while the milk is still *adhiśritam* is scarcely plausible from a practical point of view. These inconsistencies indicate that the borrowed prāyaścitti passage (in its transmitted form) was not put into practice; it was rather theoretical.

The ŚB. version is, however, not superior on all points. It quotes the same (twofold) view of the *eke* (12, 4, 2, 2 and 9) twice. JB. refers to two different (single) views (1, 55 and 56). In case the milk which is being milked becomes defiled one may hold that the gods are not loath of impurities (the view of *eke* JB. 1, 55; ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 2) and that therefore the milk may be prepared as an oblation. If the defilement takes place

after the milk has been ladled out into the *sruc* (ŚB.) or is being taken to the āhavanīya (JB.), a new argument should be adduced: the milk has been transformed into an oblation, fit and ready to be offered; it is on its way to the āhavanīya and should not be obstructed, it is *prayata-* or *pretā-* (JB. 1, 56; ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 9). Compare also the spilling expiation, where it is explicitly stated that after the ladling out of the milk the rite has to go on (one is not allowed to return to the gārhapatya; the point of no return has been passed). Therefore the quotation of the view of *eke*: *prayatam etan naitasyāhomo vakalpate* is out of place at ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 2. It may have been inserted there for the sake of parallelism with 12, 4, 2, 9, where *na vai devāḥ kasmāc cana bibhatsante* has been repeated from 12, 4, 2, 2. The incidental occurrence of a preferable version in JB. does not imply that ŚB. has borrowed from JB. since even the ŚB. text may be corrupt at times and the corruption is easily explained here.

The expiation for the defilement of the milk of ŚB. seems to be based on AB. 7, 5, 1 (*agnihotram adhiśritam amedhyam āpadyeta*) . . *uttarata āhavanīyasyoṣṇam bhasma nirūhya juhuyān manasā vā prājāpatyayā varcā. tad dhutam cāhutam ca*. The *eke* who make the impurity flow off (JB. 1, 56; ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 9) may be the Aitareyins: *tac ced vyapanayitum śaknuyān niṣicyaitad duṣṭam aduṣṭam abhiparyāsicya* . . etc.

A rather different expiation occurs KS. 35, 18-19 (= KapS. 48, 16-17) and TB. 3, 7, 2, 2 *yat kṛtāvapannena juhuyāt*. The younger Taitt. follow TB. (BSS. omits this expiation). ĀśvŚS., the Mānavas and AthPr. 4, 3 (using a different mantra) agree with KS. 35, 19. AthPr. 1, 3 (*yasyāgnihotre medhyam āpadyeta*), seems to be based on AB. 7, 5, 1. For the several kinds of impurities which may fall into an oblation see von Negelein, o.c., n. 257.

The meaning of this expiation is clear. The milk has become impure and is therefore unfit for the oblation. Most texts refrain, however, from the usual procedure for removing impure material by pouring it into water (cf. von Negelein, o.c., n. 58). Being an oblation ready to be offered it should remain within the sphere of the sacrifice. The pouring on the ashes ensures the continuity of the sacrificial operation as well as the neutralization of the impure material. The sacrifice is saved (*tad dhutam*) and the gods do not receive an oblation which they might loathe (*tad ahutam*), or in accordance with the (less theological) magico-ritualistic way of reasoning the sacrificer's life and interests are not threatened (cf. KS. and TB.: *aprajā apaśur yajamānaḥ syāt*). The Taitt. pour the milk within the enclosing sticks (cf. KS. 35, 18: 64. 9 f.). The pouring on an ant-hill may have the same function of retaining the oblation for the sacrifice: *prājāpatyayarcā valmīkavapāyām avanayet prājāpatyo vai valmīko yajñāḥ prājāpatir yajña eva yajñam pratiṣṭhāpayati* (KS. 35, 19: 66. 1 f.).

Now it is remarkable that the falling of an insect into the milk and the boiling over seem to require related expiations in TB. (3, 7, 2, 2), which remarks in both cases *aprajā apaśur yajamānaḥ syāt* (sc. if he would offer that milk) *yad anāyatane ninayet* (i.e. if he would not somehow retain it for the sacrifice) *anāyatanaḥ syāt*. He should pour the milk

with the insect within the enclosing sticks (*madhyamena pārnena dyāvāprthivyayarcāntahparidhi ninayet*); in case the milk boils over, he should pour it on an ant-hill (TB. 3, 7, 2, 1 *prājāpatyayarcā valmīkavapāyām avanayet*). The younger Taitt. agree with TB. and use the mantras *prājāpate na tvad etāny* . . (at the boiling over) and *māhī dyauh prthivi* (if an insect falls into the milk). ĀśvŚS. 3, 11, 20, however, prescribes the latter mantra at the boiling over of the milk (which is poured upon the ashes near the āhavanīya; cf. the *amedhyam* expiation) and the former at the falling of an insect in the milk (in this case the milk is poured on the ant-hill instead of within the enclosing sticks). MSS. 3, 2, 7 uses the mantras as ĀśvŚS., but mentions the pouring on the ant-hill and within the enclosing sticks as alternatives in both cases. The palāśa leaf used by the Taitt. and ĀśvŚS. for the insect has been transferred from this expiation to the boiling over of the milk by the Mānavas and is also applied by HirŚS. (apparently the latest of the three younger Taitt.) to the wrong expiation. This mixing up of the two expiations in the sūtras is not based on any intrinsic agreements between the two accidents to be expiated, but on a corruption in the oldest sources. KS. 35, 18-19 (= KapS. 48, 16-17) has a double treatment of the expiation *yat kṛtāvapannena juhuyāt*, a fact which in itself is already suspicious. In the one version (35, 18: 64. 8 ff.) one should pour with the palāśa leaf within the enclosing sticks, in the other (35, 19: 65. 13 ff.) (without the leaf) upon an ant-hill. TB. rightly splits this expiation into two different ones. One may doubt, however, whether the clause *aprajā apaśur yajamānaḥ syāt* (occurring in both versions of the *kṛtāvapannam* expiation in KS.) should refer to the *kṛtāvapannam* as well as the *viśyannam* expiation in TB. Why should the falling of an insect into the milk imply that offering that milk means loss of progeny and cattle? That the loss of milk due to boiling over would bring about the loss of progeny and cattle is, however, very plausible since the agnihotra milk represents the sacrificer, his life (in the full sense of the word), his interests. So we are to infer that in the corrupt KS. passage the *viśyannam* expiation has dropped out of the text, but has left traces in the form of the double occurrence of the clause *aprajā apaśur* . . and of one of the two versions of the *kṛtāvapannam* expiation. It seems that TB. has adopted the wrong version of the two for its *kṛtāvapannam* expiation. The milk into which an insect has fallen is impure and therefore should be poured upon the ant-hill (see von Negelein, o.c., n. 741). The boiling over of the milk, however, does not cause impurity, but may be regarded as a kind of spilling (as is done by AB. 7, 5, 2). This milk is disqualified for offering and is therefore poured out within the enclosing sticks. So the corruption of the KS. passage seems to have brought about the confusion of the two expiations. Remarkably ĀśvŚS. and to some extent MSS. and AthPr. have the correct version of the *kṛtāvapannam* expiation.

The falling of rain on the milk has been taken together with the defilement of the milk in one expiation by JB. For the same combination compare KS. 35, 19 (= KapS. 48, 17) and TB. 3, 7, 2, 3. On the other hand JB. and ŚB. consider raining to be auspicious (see e.g. the spilling

expiation JB. 1, 53). Perhaps the two expiations are combined in JB. due to the fact that they are successive in the source, ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 9-10.

The other texts prescribe that the milk should be offered with a mantra dedicated to Mitra (*mitro janān yātayati* .. RV. 3, 59, 1; TS. 3, 4, 11) and observe: *mitro vai yajñasya śāntir mitreṇaivainam śamayati* (TB.: *mitreṇaivainat kalpayati*). A new cow should be milked and a new oblation be made. See Hoens, *Śānti*, p. 40 f., whose interpretation that "a foreign power wants to disturb the sacrifice" and that Mitra "who gives all the powers their places (√yat- or √klp-) and who thus controls them, is the god who is also able to check the activity of this power which disturbs the sacrifice (śam-)" is not convincing in all respects. Neither rain itself nor the givers of rain are evil powers. The falling of rain though connected with the falling of impurities in the context does not cause an ordinary defilement. If one should offer that milk *aparūpam asyātmaṁ jāyeta* (KS. 35, 19: 65. 7) "his body would become deformed". TB. explains this as *kilāso vā syād arśaso vā* "he would become suffering from leprosy or haemorrhoids". Apparently the rain-drops on the milk oblation (to be regarded as the sacrificer himself) will bring about white or grey spots (or ulcers) on the body of the sacrificer, who will suffer from the mentioned diseases. Since non-offering of this oblation or returning to the gārhapatya is excluded, one offers that milk with the mantra to Mitra in order that Mitra, who settles, orders, arranges all in this universe (*yātayati/kalpayati*) and appeases or straightens out the sacrifice (*mitro vai yajñasya śāntiḥ*) may appease or fix (*śamayati*) or order (*kalpayati*) this questionable sacrifice. Water as such not being impure and even admissible as an addition to the milk the function of Mitra (the supervisor and regulator of all sorts of contacts between human beings, parties or other entities, rather than someone's "friend") may also be promoting the fusion between the milk and the heavenly fluid, i.e. the putting together of fluids from two different spheres and the dissolving of the drops into the milk. The younger Taitt. follow TB.; ĀśvŚS. and AthPr. agree with KS.

55. Now they say: "If into the agnihotra milk of this performer of a long sacrificial session, viz. the offerer of the agnihotra, something impure should fall¹ while it is being milked, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Some opine that nevertheless it should be offered, arguing: "Surely the gods have no loathing² for anything". He should, however, not consider it thus. Does man, indeed, loathe from the loathful, loathing even is found with gods.³ He should proceed thus: Having pushed⁴ some hot cinders out of the gārhapatya he should silently pour that (milk) on them. Thus it is neither offered, nor unoffered.⁵ He should pour water after it. By means of water he obtains⁶ that (milk). Then he should offer with what else he may procure.

Now further they say: "If something impure should fall into it after it has been milked, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Having pushed back the coals on which he was going to put it he should silently pour it on them. Thus it is neither offered, nor unoffered. He should pour water after it. By means of water he obtains that (milk).

Now further they say: "If something impure should fall into it after it has been put on the fire, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Having pushed back the coals on which it has been put he should silently pour it on them. Thus it is neither offered, nor unoffered. That⁷ he pours it on them, thereby it is offered; that by means of it he extinguishes them,⁸ thereby it is unoffered. He should pour water after it. By means of water he obtains that (milk). Then he should offer with what else he may procure.

Now they further say:

56. "If something impure should fall into the milk with which the officiant has moved eastward (i.e. to the āhavaniya), what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Now some opine that nevertheless it should be offered, arguing: "It is already on its way,⁹ it is not suitable to offer it not". And some pour (the impurity) away¹⁰ by pouring water on to it. He should, however, not do it thus. If any one should say in that case: "He has poured away this agnihotra milk, this sacrificer will be poured away",¹¹ it would come to pass so. He should proceed in this way: Having put a firewood on the āhavaniya and having pushed some hot cinders out of the āhavaniya he should silently pour that (milk) on them. Thereby it is neither offered, nor unoffered. He should pour water after it. By means of water he obtains that (milk). Then he should offer with what else he may procure.

Now further they say: "If rain should fall upon it, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" He should consider: " 'Light' has come to me from above.¹² My generative power has been increased. I shall become more prosperous"¹³ (and) it would come to pass so.¹⁴

NOTES

¹ *agnihotram* .. *amedhyam āpadyeta* does not mean "If any one's Agnihotra-milk were to become impure" (Eggeling), but as E. hesitatingly proposes in his footnote "If anything impure were to get (fall) into any one's Agnihotra-milk". See Minard, *Trois Énigmes* II, § 593 a. Cf. also AthPr. 1, 3 *agnihotre 'medhyam āpadyeta*; ŚB. 1, 2, 5, 26 *kṛm cid āpadyeta*.

² For *bībhatsa iti* (thus all mss.) I read with Oertel and the ŚB. version *bībhatsanta iti*.

³ Oertel's reading *puruṣo neva bībhatsēyād bībhatsate bībhatsantāitu devāḥ* seems to imply a contrast of non-loathing human beings and loathing gods, which hardly suits the context. Moreover *iva* in *neva* is difficult to explain (according to D. Schrapel, *Untersuchung der Partikel iva*, thesis Marburg 1970, p. 16 *neva* could mean "noch nicht" in ŚB. 1, 6, 4, 7). For his *tu* the ŚB. version *bībhatsantāzi tu devāḥ* is not a real parallel since in ŚB. *tu* (together with the pluti) expresses the rejection of the assumption *na vai devāḥ kasmāc cana bībhatsante*. In JB. *bībhatsantāi* (whatever may be the correct reading a pluti should be assumed) forms an antithetical, complementary pair with *bībhatsate*. Raghu Vira reads (with many question-marks in the crit. app.) *neva* and *bībhatsantāz devāḥ* (mss.: *bībhatsantāidu; bībhatsantām udu*). I suggest reading *bībhatsantāz id u devāḥ*. For the sandhi of *āzi* before vowels see Wackernagel-Debrunner, *Altind. Grammatik* I, p. 229. The particles *nu eva* may be used in the first of two antithetical clauses (Macdonnell, *Vedic Gr. f. St.*, p. 239) and *id u* emphasizing preceding words (including finite verb forms) may be translated by "even". Cf. *sadyśīr adya sadyśīr id u svaḥ* (Macdonnell, o.c., p. 218). The pluti underlines the antithetical structure of the sentence.

⁴ For *nirūhya* and *pratyūhya* of the crit. ed. (see also Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 64) compare AB. 7, 5, 1; TB. 2, 1, 3, 1 and most sūtras. Oertel and the ŚB. version read *nirūhya* and *pratyūhya*. Cf. KSS. 4, 14, 2; ŚSS. 2, 8, 8; 15.

⁵ *tan na hutam nāhutam* (ŚB. version *tad dhutam ahutam*). Cf. TS. 6, 1, 4, 5 *tan neva hutam nevāhutam*. For the problem of offering and non-offering see ŚB. 13, 2, 4, 3 and Arbman, *Rudra. Untersuchungen zum altindischen Glauben und Kultus* (thesis Uppsala 1922), p. 51.

⁶ See the introduction to the preceding section on this "etymological" magic.

⁷ *aha* is not an explicative particle (Eggeling: "for"), but expresses together with *u* in the next clause a slight antithesis. See Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 520.

⁸ Eggeling's translation of *yad v enāns tenaivānugamayati* "inasmuch as he extinguishes it along with them" is puzzling. The extinction of the coals implies that no oblation has been offered, offering consisting in the burning of an oblation.

⁹ Oertel's conjecture *prayatam* (the reading of ŚB.) for *pretam* is superfluous, if one takes *preta-* ("advanced"; transferred from the rite which has proceeded, or from the priest who has started for the āhavanīya, to the milk itself, cf. *uddruta-*) as a correct equivalent of *prayatam* meaning "(already) presented", "all but offered as an oblation" (i.e. too far advanced in the sacrificial procedure to be withheld). Perhaps also *prayatam* has been misinterpreted as *prayātam* by the JB. For the exchange of *prayata* and *preta* also compare Section 12-14, n. 12 (on *prayati-* and *preti-*).

¹⁰ JB. has replaced *chardayanti* (ŚB.; "they make the milk spit it out") by the colourless *parāsiñcanti*, which anticipates *parāñ . . asiñcat* (ŚB. *parāsiñcata*).

¹¹ Cf. ŚB. 1, 5, 2, 15 *yathā pūrṇapātram parāsiñced evaṃ ha sa yajamānam parāsiñcet*; 13, 1, 6, 3 *parā vā eṣa sicyate yo 'balo 'śvamedhena yajati* (where the context does not deal with the pouring of liquids, which proves that *parāsiñcati* is metaphorically used in ŚB. and means "to annihilate, sweep away").

¹² *upariṣṭān mā śukram āgann* (JB. *āgāt*) "Light (or sap) has come to me

from above" (Eggeling). Here "sap" would be suitable, but JB. 1, 64 (= ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 2, dealing with the mingling of the fires) requires a different translation. See also ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 4 (lightning hits the fire). Because of the three contexts "light", especially in its figurative sense of "help", seems to be the required meaning.

¹³ For this passage of three clauses see also JB. 1, 53 (= ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 7), JB. 1, 64 (= ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 2) and ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 4. In all the contexts the third clause runs *śreyān bhaviṣyāmi*. In all the ŚB. passages except 12, 4, 1, 7 *upa māṃ devāḥ prābhūvan* forms the second clause. In JB. this clause is only found in the spilling expiation (1, 53), where it seems to be used secondarily (as first clause). ŚB. does not apply this phrase in the spilling expiation. The original version may have been *upa riṣṭān mā śukram āgann, upa māṃ devāḥ prābhūvañ, chreyān bhaviṣyāmi*, with as a secondary variant *parastān mā . .* In the JB. version *prajātir me bhūyasy abhūt* (second clause) has been taken from the spilling expiation (cf. ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 7) and has superseded *upa mā devāḥ prābhūvan* (incorrectly transposed to the spilling expiation, where consequently the original *bahuḥ prajāyā paśubhir bhaviṣyāmi* has been omitted).

¹⁴ *tathā haiva syāt*, the usual apodosis after a protasis introduced by *yo ha tatra brūyāt* or variants (JB. 1, 52; 54; 56; 61), is rather odd here and in the JB. parallels (mentioned in n. 13). Does the optative *vidyāt* have a potential rather than a prescriptive force here ("he might know or consider . . [and if he would do so] it would come true)?

NOTES

¹ In view of ŚB. *abhyasya* one may prefer *adhyasya* to *adhyasyan* (thus the crit. ed. and Oertel).

² *sa yadi tasyām na tiṣṭhed*. The meaning of *sthā* with loc. is not "to abide by", "to be satisfied with" (thus Oertel, o.c., p. 338, n. 10 referring to AB. 7, 18, 4), but "to rely on" (cf. *Petr. Dict.*, s.v.: 14 *mayi sthitvā*).

³ The gold represents the fire. See von Negelein, o.c., n. 800 quoting BrahṁPr. 46 b *agnisampādanārtham hiraṇyam nidhāya*.

⁴ Cf. ŚB. 2, 1, 1, 5 *tad dhiranyam abhavat tasmād etad agnisamkāśam agner hi retas*.

56. (last paragraph). *The fire of the coals goes out after the first oblation has been offered*

For this expiation compare ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 1, where it starts a new chapter on the extinction of fires. Its position in JB., where it neither begins with the stock phrase *yad etasya dīrghasattriṇaḥ* . . , which introduces new, independent expiations, nor even starts a new chapter, can only be explained by the fact that in ŚB., its source, it also follows the rainfall expiation.

Instead of *dārau dārau hy agniḥ* the ŚB. version has *dārau dārāv agnir iti vadan dārau dārau hy evāgniḥ*. The sūtras (BŚS. 28, 12; BhārŚS. 9, 3, 12; ĀpŚS. 9, 2, 8; HirŚS. 15, 1, 47; VaiŚS. 20, 5; MŚS. 3, 2, 9) have taken the words *dārau dārāv agnir* as a yajus and read *agnir dārau dārāv agniḥ* (Bhār. even adds *agāt svāhā*). The cause of this reinterpretation seems to be the correspondence to the agnihotra formula *agnir jyotir jyotir agniḥ* and the fact that *vadan* (ŚB.) was misunderstood. In these expiations *vadantaḥ* frequently occurs with the meaning "reasoning, arguing" rather than "saying, reciting". Due to this reinterpretation the oblation is not offered on any piece of wood which may be available (Agni being present in every piece of wood according to ŚB./JB.), but on a wood-block in the fire (in contrast to ŚB., where a piece of wood from outside has to be put on the fire: *abhyasya*!) which is lying nearest to the extinguished *samidh* (Bhār. *antame śakale*; Āp. *anantare śakale*). Apparently this explicit mentioning of the nearest piece of wood (not occurring in all the sūtras) is only to be explained as a relic of the brāhmaṇa version, where *prativeśa-* (see Caland, *Z.D.M.G.* 72, p. 4) and *antika-* meaning "lying on hand, being present and near, available" makes sense in connection with the statement *dārau dārāv agniḥ*. If no wood from outside is put on the fire, one may ask why there should be offered on a *śakala* (and not on a *samidh*) and why this *śakala* should be *anantara-* or *antama-*.

According to ĀsvŚS. 3, 14, 23 the oblation should be offered on a piece of gold (compare the present section). This text does not mention the offering on a piece of wood.

56 (last paragraph). Now further they say: "If, after the first oblation¹ has been offered, the coals should become extinct, where should he offer the second?" Having thrown¹ on the fire any log of wood which may be lying near there he should offer (on it). For in every piece of wood there is fire (or: Agni). If he should have no confidence² in this (expiation), he should offer upon gold.³ Now gold is the seed of Agni⁴ and the father is identical with the son. Therefore he should offer upon gold.

Now further they say:

57. The death of the agnihotrin during the rite

ŚB. (12, 4, 2, 5) offers a parallel only for the death of the sacrificer after the milk has been put on the fire (*adhiśritam*). In JB. these expiations form a separate chapter, which is not introduced by the stock phrase *tad āhuḥ yad etasya dīrghasattrīṇaḥ* . . always occurring at the beginning of a new, independent expiation. This special expiation in which the sacrificer himself forms the subject did not allow this stereotyped phrase.

For the first expiation (*paryādhāyaivainad viṣyandayet*) compare ŚB. *tad eva inad abhiparyādhāya viṣyandayet* "Having enclosed it, let him pour it out" (Eggeling); AB. 7, 2, 2 *tad āhur ya āhitāgnir adhiśrite 'gnihotre sāmṇāyē vā haviṣṣu vā mriyeta kā tatra prāyaścittir ity atrai-vaināny anuparyādadhyaḥ yathā sarvāṇi samdahyeran* "(...) He should put all around so that they may all be burned together" (Keith); AthPr. 2, 9 *atha yo 'dhiśrite 'gnihotre yajamāno mriyeta katham tatra kuryāt tatra ivaitat paryādadhyaḥ yathā sarvaśaḥ samdahyetety athāhavanīya ājyāhutam juhuyāt* "(...) One should pour out the agnihotra-milk in such a manner that it burns out completely" (*Śrautakośa* I, p. 164). The parallels prove that *tad eva* in ŚB. (not translated by Eggeling) should mean "there, on the spot" (cf. ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 8 *tadevopaviṣed*) i.e. "on the gārhapatya (on which the pot has been placed)". Compare KSS. 25, 7, 7 ff. (not exclusively referring to the agnihotra): "If the sacrificer dies after the preparation of the oblation but before the placing of the oblation within the altar, one should burn out the oblation on the gārhapatya fire. If the sacrificer dies after the placing of the oblation, one should burn out the oblation on the āhavanīya fire" (*Śrautakośa* I, p. 472). Keith likewise does not render *tatraiva* and moreover wrongly takes *sarvāṇi* as "all" (referring to all kinds of offerings mentioned in this expiation?) instead of "in their totality, completely" (cf. AthPr. *sarvaśaḥ*). The pot on the gārhapatya is surrounded on all sides with fuel and fire so that (*yathā*) the milk or the other oblatory material burns out entirely. In the case of the milk one makes it boil over (*viṣyandayati*); thus it is burnt in the additional fire put around the pot. This burning of the milk seems to represent a cremation of the sacrificer, who is identical with the oblation.

The two other expiations of this section have no parallels in the brāhmaṇas. For the death of the agnihotrin after the first libation has been offered see ĀpŚS. 9, 11, 20 (referring to JB.?).

57. "If the sacrificer should die after the agnihotra milk has been put on (the gārhapatya), what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Having surrounded it with fire he should make it boil over. This is the rite in that case. And this is indeed also the

expiation for all the *haviryajñas* (in case the sacrificer would die).

Now they further say: "If the sacrificer should die after the officiant has moved with the milk to the east (i.e. to the āhavanīya), what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" What is appointed to be ladled out four times on that occasion,¹ to that he should pour that (milk) on. This is the rite in that case.

Now they further say: "If the sacrificer should die after the first oblation has been offered, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Now some hold that nevertheless it should be offered, arguing: "The whole agnihotra is² offered by him who has offered the first oblation". He should, however, not consider it thus. One does² not offer the agnihotra for a deceased. What is appointed to be ladled out four times on that occasion,¹ to that he should pour that (milk) on. This is the rite in that case.

NOTES

¹ *yad evādayaś caturgrhītam ādiṣṭam syāt* (crit. ed.) does not make sense. Oertel conjectures *evādaś*, the reading of one of his manuscripts in the next paragraph, where *ya*, *ra* and *sa* read *evādaś*. This *evādaś* may be the correct reading if our interpretation of the rite is correct. The milk seems to be poured on the *caturgrhītam* oblation which is prescribed "there, on that (other) occasion, i.e. at the death and funeral of the sacrificer". For the use of the milk from the agnihotra at the pitṛmedha see Caland, *Bestattungsgebräuche*, p. 7 and ĀpŚS. 9, 11, 20. For the meaning of *adas* required here see JB. 1, 54 (see introduction of section 53-54); ŚB. 7, 1, 2, 10. Here *tatraiva* seems to stand for *tasminn eva* (referring to *yad* . . *caturgrhītam*).

² The pres. indic. *bhavati* and (in the next sentence) *na* . . *juhoti* express a prescription. Compare English "one does not . .", i.e. "one should not . ."

58-59. The cow sits down while being milked

For this section compare ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 9-10. The expiation is found also MS. 1, 8, 8; TB. 1, 4, 3, 1 ff.; AB. 7, 3, 1 f.

First ŚB. and JB. refer to the view of *eke* who make the cow rise. These are the Taittirīyas, whose explanation of the *yajus* to be recited on that occasion is partly identical to that quoted by ŚB. with *iti vada-ntah*. The JB. version inserting the statement *avrttim vā eṣā yajamānasya* ... (occurring at the end of the passage in TB. and ŚB.) directly after *utthāpayanti* thereby separates *yajusā* from the quotation of the *yajus ud asthād devy aditir* ... and consequently has to repeat *tām utthāpayanti*. ŚB., the source of JB., on some points agrees more than JB. with the freely quoted TB. text, but once JB. seems to have been directly influenced by TB. (as well as ŚB.):

TB.	<i>avartim vā eṣaitasya</i>	<i>pāpmānam</i>	<i>pratikhyaṇā niśidati</i>
JB.	<i>avrttim vā eṣā yajamānasya</i>	<i>pāpmānam</i>	<i>pratidrśyopaviśati</i>
ŚB.	<i>artim vā eṣā</i>	<i>pāpmānam yajamānasya</i>	<i>pratidrśyopaviśati</i> .
TB.	<i>yasyāgnihotry upasr̥ṣṭā niśidati</i> .		
JB.	<i>yasyāgnihotri duhyamānopaviśati</i> .		

The parallel versions of ŚB. and JB. reading *pratidrśya* prove that TB. *pratikhyaṇā* should not be interpreted with Dumont as "en proclamant" (cf. *Śrautakośa* I, p. 154 "declaring"), but as "foreseeing" (Keith, *Rigveda Brahmanas*, p. 252 in his translation of AB. 5, 27, 6 which deals with the expiation for the lowing of the cow). Compare also AthPr. 2, 4 *aśanāpi-pāse evaiṣā yajamānasya samprakhyāya vāśyati* (...) *bhayaṃ vā eṣā yajamānasya* (von Negelein, o.c., p. XIX "Nun, sie brüllt, weil sie des Opferveranstalters Hunger und Durst ansagen will"). Although *prakhyāti* (unlike *pratikhyaṇā*) may be taken as "to announce", the use of the gerund (mostly expressing an action passed prior to the action of the finite verb) is in favour of the other interpretation.

As was observed above, ŚB. and JB. do not verbally quote the TB. passage in their reference to the view of *eke*. On the one hand the rather forced explanations of pādas c-d of the mantra are not found in TB., which only states *yathāyajur evaitad*. On the other hand ŚB. and JB. omit the identification cow = earth, which occurs in their source (TB. 1, 4, 3, 2 *iyam vā agnihotri*, followed by the equation *iyam vai devy aditih*), and thereby lack an important link in their argument. The cow is the earth, Aditi is the earth, therefore the earth is raised (i.e. they rouse the earth to a greater production?) by the verse *ud asthād devy aditih* (and by the actual raising of the cow). For an identification of Aditi and cow (which is not expressed here) see ŚB. 2, 3, 4, 34; 14, 2, 1, 7. According to TB. the cow should be given away after the milking. ŚB. has *tasyām āhutyām* "at this offering" (Eggeling) and JB. has the (presumably preferable) prescription that the cow should be given after the

milk has been offered (*tasyām evāhutau hutāyām*). As to the giving away of the cow AB. only prescribes that the receiver should be a brahmin, whereas TB. specifies *yasyānnaṃ nādyāt*. ŚB. freely quotes this as *yam anabhyāgamiṣyan manyeta*. The limitation to one year as found in the JB. version (*yam samvatsaram anabhyāgamiṣyanta bhavanti*) may be a later mitigation of the expiation. Compare ĀśvŚS. 3, 11, 2, where only the milk and not the (more expensive) cow is given to a brahmin *yasyā-bhokṣyan syāt yāvajjivam samvatsaram vā*.

After quoting the view of *eke* ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 10 f. puts forward an own interpretation of this sitting down of the cow by introducing two teachers who frequently play a role in ŚB., viz. Yājñavalkya and Āruṇi, and representing their opinion. Here JB. obviously borrows the ŚB. passage. It calls Yājñavalkya the Vājasaneyā. Moreover the view of Āruṇi (ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 11), who is rather sceptical of several expiations among which the sitting down of the cow is mentioned as the last and most important (therefore ŚB. considers this passage together with the preceding paragraph as dealing with the same expiation), has been transformed into a new expiation. JB. 1, 60 (= ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 11) starts with the stock phrase which introduces a new expiation. Retaining the secondary division of the text as made by JB. itself we deal with JB. 1, 60 (*agnihotrivatso naśyet*) in a separate section. That JB. 1, 59 and 60, however, originally form a unity does not appear only from the parallel and source ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 10 f., but also from some inconsistencies in the JB. text itself. The last sentence of JB. 1, 59 (*tām ātmann eva kurovītātmann eva tac chriyam dhatta iti*) absolutely does not fit in the context, which nowhere refers to *śrī*. The ŚB. version of this chapter (12, 4, 1, 10) does not have this sentence, but in the next paragraph it is found in a quite suitable context; it is preceded by *śriyo vai parjanyo varṣati* ...; *śremāṇam me* ... *adhārayamāṇā* ...; *śreyān bhaviṣyāmi*. In the JB. parallel (1, 60) these references are missing. Therefore and because JB. had transformed this passage into a new expiation (*agnihotrivatso naśyet*), the conclusion *tām ātmann eva kurovītātmann eva tac chriyam dhatta iti* could not be placed at the end of JB. 1, 60 and consequently had to be transferred to the end of 1, 59. In that position *tām ātmann eva kurovīta* is suitable to some extent, but the argumentation *ātmann eva tac chriyam dhatta* can only be explained as a clumsy borrowing from ŚB.

In the Jaiminiya version of Yājñavalkya's view *avrttyā hi tam vidhyanti* seems to be a corruption of ŚB. (12, 4, 1, 10) *artyo vā āhutim vidhyanti* "and they smite the offering with trouble" (Eggeling). Is (*avrttyā*) *hi tam* based on *āhutim*? The clearest proof of borrowing is procured by the automatical replacement of *artyā* (which is in no way connected with *artim* ... *pāpmānam* in the preceding brāhmaṇam; cf. JB. *avrttim* ... *pāpmānam*) by *avrttyā*. Consequently (offerings not being smitten with absence of livelihood) *āhutim* had to be dropped. The criticism put forward by Yājñavalkya (in ŚB.) is: a) They lose a (or the cow) only because they lack faith or confidence, i.e. needlessly. b) They frustate the offering only because of their lack of faith, i.e. they

have needlessly made an expiation and thereby make a failure of this sacrifice. For *artyā* in connection with *vidhyati* denoting the frustrating of a sacrifice compare JB. 2, 221 *tān yajñasyartyāvidhyat* "Dieser traf sie, indem er ihr Opfer störte" (Caland, *Auswahl*, p. 183). In the reinterpretation (or corruption) of JB. *tam* may refer either to *gauḥ* (then the sing. masc. should quite unusually mean "cattle"), or to the brahmin to whom they transfer the *avrtti pāpman*, which is hardly a better solution. Why should smiting a brahmin with absence of livelihood be the reason (*hi*) that the cow (or cattle) passes away from them *āsraddadhānebhyaḥ*?

The development of this expiation seems to be the following. In the oldest text (MS.) the cow sits down not bearing the sacrificer's suffering (*avartim . . yajamānasyānutsahya*) and is given to a brahmin (*yasyānnam nādyāt*) together with the *avarti*. TB. follows MS., but adds the raising of the cow with the *yajus ud asthād . .* (occurring also in AB.), which introduces a new interpretation: the cow is the earth. Thus two approaches of the accident are mixed up. In TB. the conclusion is not yet drawn that the cow being the earth cannot be given away. According to AB. the mantra *yasmād bhiṣā niṣḍasi . .* should be recited (not found in the parallel brāhmaṇas), the cow should be raised with *ud asthād . .* (cf. TB.), water should be put or held under her udder and mouth (*athāsya udapātram ūdhasi ca mukhe copagrhñiyād*; the bowl is hardly placed on the udder and mouth, as Keith interprets *upagrh-*) and the cow should be given away. ŚB. rejects the TB. expiation by quoting the views of two well-known teachers referring to the two aspects of this *prāyaścitti*. Yājñavalkya (12, 4, 1, 10) deals only with the old version (the cow sitting down in distress), which he replaces by a more positive and optimistic interpretation. Āruṇi, however, considers (12, 4, 1, 11) the cosmic aspect of the rite (as was already done by TB. in its equation *agnihotri* = earth) and concludes on account of his own identifications (*agnihotri* = heaven; *agnihotrasthālī* = earth) that the cow should not be given away since it brings prosperity. He might as well have said (cf. *kva hy asau naśyet*; *kva hīyam bhidyeta*) *kva hy asau dīyeta* "where should it be given away?". Among the sūtras BŚS. and BhārSS. completely agree with TB., whereas the two later Taitt. ĀpSS. (9, 5, 2 ff.) and HirSS. (15, 2, 1 ff.) show influences from AB. by the *abhimantrana* of the cow with *yasmād bhiṣā niṣḍasi* (Āp. *nyasadah*). This mantra also occurs TB. 3, 7, 8, 1 (in the Āp. version), but the relevant expiation is missing in TB. These sūtras mention the expiation of ŚB. (JB.) as an alternative. Perhaps *tām ātmann eva kurvīta* especially refers to the JB. version (1, 59; ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 11 has *tām ātmany eva kurvīta*). Moreover the cow is fed (like the lowing cow AB. 7, 3, 3; ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 12) with grass (cf. ŚB.), while the mantra *sūyavasād bhagavati . .* (cf. AB.) is recited. The Hir. passage, which omits the clause *avartim evāsmi pāpmānam pratimuñcatīti viṣṇūyate* and combines the lowing of the cow with the milking of blood in one expiation (without the mantra *yasmād bhiṣāvāsiṣṭhās*, ĀpSS. 9, 5, 11) seems to be later than Āp. Apparently AthPr. 2, 4 is based on AB., which seems also to have influenced, directly or by way of ĀśvSS., the Mānavas (MSS. 3, 2, 1: water is applied

to the udders and the mouth). Most interesting is VādhS. 3, 20 (A.O. 4, p. 22), which seems to betray influences of ŚB.: *... tad vidyāc: chreyān bhaviṣyāmi* (= ŚB.), *yajño mopānamśid, yajñakratūn me dhārayanty agnihotry upāvīkṣad iti* (cf. ŚB. *tad vidyāc chremānam me mahimānam adhārayamāṇo pavīkṣac . .*). One should read *adhārayanty* or rather **dhārayanty* instead of Caland's *dhārayanty*.

58. Now they say: "If the agnihotra cow of this performer of a long sacrificial session, viz. the offerer of the agnihotra, should sit down while being milked, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Some now cause her to stand up with a formula. One should know that, if any one's agnihotra cow sits down while being milked, she does so, because she has seen evil¹ for the sacrificer consisting of absence of livelihood.² They cause her to stand up (reciting the formula): "The divine Aditi has risen". The divine Aditi is this (earth). Thereby they cause this (earth) to rise for him. "She has put life into the lord of sacrifice". Thereby they put (long) life into him. "Giving Indra his share". Thereby they put power into him. "And to Mitra and Varuṇa". Mitra and Varuṇa indeed are out- and inbreathing.³ Thereby they put out- and inbreathing into him. After the oblation has been offered they give her away to a brahmin whom they will not visit during a year arguing: "To him we transfer⁴ the evil of absence of livelihood".

59. As to this now the Vājasaneyā observed: "They lose⁵ a cow only due to lack of faith. ⁶For they smite him (?) with absence of livelihood. ⁶He should proceed thus: He should take a stick and make her stand up by pricking with it. As it also happens in daily life⁷ that one drives in a cart for making a journey and the mule breaks down,⁸ or that an ox after being yoked (to the cart or to the plough) sits down,⁹ and one attains the desired distance by urging that (animal) on by means of a stick or a goad, so one attains the desired world in heaven by urging her on by means of a stick or goad. He should keep her for himself. On himself he thereby bestows fortune."

NOTES

¹ Eggeling translates *artim . . pāpmānam* in the ŚB. version of this passage by "suffering and evil". See also Dumont, o.c., p. 245 "la misère, le malheur" (TB. 1, 4, 3, 3); *Śrautakośa* I, p. 154 "the evil distress" (BŚS. 14, 23 quoting TB.). Presumably *pāpmānam* should neither be interpreted as an adjective, nor as an independent noun in an asyndetic construction, but as an apposition. See Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 424 a and JB. 1, 10 (section 9-10, n.9).

² *avrtti pāpman* also occurs JB. 1, 54. The parallel texts have *artī pāpman*

(ŚB.) or *avarti pāpman* (TB.; see also VādhS. 4, 60, A.O. 6, p. 171 f. *te 'vartim pāpmanam kṣudham brahmahatyām pratyūhya* . . ; Caland erroneously observes that the word *avarti* "bis jetzt nur aus der Rs. zu belegen ist"). Both are derived from *ṛ-* and not from *vṛt-*. They do not refer particularly to absence of livelihood (see the quoted VādhS. passage, where *kṣudh-* is mentioned as a separate evil). The JB. version *avṛtti-* may be a reinterpretation of *avarti-* (TB.) rather than of *ārti-*, but compare AthPr. 2, 4 and AB. 5, 27, 6, where the cow foreseeing hunger and thirst (= *avṛtti*) starts lowing. For *avṛtti* see further JB. 1, 252 (*na . . aśanāyati na pipāsati nāsyā kā canāvṛttir bhavati*) and JB. 2, 6 (where Lokesh Chandra, *Gavāmayana*, p. 14, n. 33 seems to misunderstand *nāśanāyati na pipāsati nāsyā kā canāvṛttir bhavati*, as appears from his remark: "*nāsyā kā canāvṛttir bhavati* may be taken to refer to transmigration"; the correct analysis should be *avṛttir*; moreover transmigration scarcely plays a role in the older parts of this brāhmaṇa).

³ Instead of *prāṇāpānau* ŚB. has *prāṇodānau*, which proves that *udāna* in the compound at least means "inbreathing" in ŚB. Otherwise Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 165 b. For *prāṇāpānau* see Caland, *Z.D.M.G.* 55, p. 261 ff.

⁴ ŚB. *pratimuñcāma iti* more closely follows TB. *pratimuñcati* than JB. *niveśayāma iti*.

⁵ For *apakram-* referring to the loss of something see e.g. ŚB. 4, 6, 9, 4 "that food . . does not go away from them" (Eggeling), where instead of "to go away" I would prefer "to become lost". It mostly refers to the loss of energy, royal power, vital airs, etc. ŚB. 13, 2, 6, 7 "neither fiery spirit, nor energy, nor cattle, nor prosperity pass away from him" (Eggeling), i.e. he does not lose cattle, energy etc. So *apakram-* in the present passage does not imply an intentional action of the cow, e.g. walking away, and Eggeling's translation "the cow turns from them as from faithless ones" should be rejected.

⁶ On this (probably corrupt) clause see the introduction of this section.

⁷ *adas* (Eggeling translates "here") denoting that which is not present may as an adverb refer to place or time. It indicates that something happens on another occasion rather than being "indice d'une antériorité proche ou lointaine" (Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 191 a). As such it is indifferent as to the time this occasion takes place. It is not only used "soit pour rappeler une procédure déjà vue (see e.g. JB. 1, 54; ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 8), soit pour évoquer la geste mythique dont la geste rituel est le reflet" (Minard, l.c.), but may also refer in a comparison (as here) to the non-ritual sphere, daily life, to be taken as the other occasion which may be situated in past, present or future. Primarily meaning "there" it does not only denote the other place or sphere, but also the "not-happening-here" and in that (to some extent) temporal sense ("on that other occasion, then") it may often refer to the past. For *adas* in comparisons as here see Caland, *Auswahl*, p. 16 and p. 63 and Rau, *Staat und Gesellschaft*, p. 31, who translate "im gewöhnlichen Leben".

⁸ For *gadāyate* the ŚB. version has (perhaps more correctly) *gadāyeta*. Thieme, *Pratidānam*, *Studies* . . Kuiper (The Hague 1968), p. 385 rightly criticizes Eggeling's rendering "might become weary". Since *gadāyate* literally means "to become ill", one may prefer his "zusammenbrechen". The collapse may be due to excessive speed, but other causes, e.g. the length of the journey, are conceivable. Therefore I do not agree with Thieme that *dhāvayataḥ* were to imply that one "mit höchster Eile seinen Weg zurücklegt" (moreover in the case of the ox the "Eile" would lie in the intention of the driver rather than be realized by the animal). Everywhere *dhāvayati* means

"to drive". The speed depends on the contexts. I hope to give a more detailed discussion of Thieme's interpretation of *dhāvayati* on another occasion.

⁹ *upaviśati*, missing in ŚB., may have been inserted in JB. for the sake of a more exact comparison. On the other hand, however, *balivardo vā yukta*s without *upaviśati* and therefore to be taken with *gadāyeta* stands in a rather strange position after the predicate in the ŚB. version. Should one connect *yuktas* with all three animals (as Eggeling and Thieme, *Pratidānam*, p. 385 do)? Perhaps *dhāvayataḥ* and *gadāyeta* have to be used only with the horse (missing in JB.) and the mule, which become exhausted by the long or swift journey and have to be beaten with a stick, whereas the ox sits down (*upaviś-*, dropped out in ŚB.) after being yoked to the cart (i.e. at the start of a journey as oxen may do even without being tired) and is raised by means of a goad. This interpretation accounts for the twofold urging forward (*dandaprajitena tottraprajitena*).

60. The calf of the agnihotra cow is lost. The cow milks blood

On the first paragraph see the introduction of Section 58-59. The expiation *yad etasya dīrghasattriṇo 'gnihotraṁ juhvato 'gnihotrīvatso naśyet* has no parallel in any text. In fact, though being introduced by the stock phrase *yad etasya dīrghasattriṇo* . . ., it does not form an independent *prāyaścitti*. ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 11, its source, mentions the views of Āruṇi on the agnihotra in connection with the sitting down of the cow. The quotation of Āruṇi's interpretation of the agnihotra is not confined to the expiation under discussion. Āruṇi did not express his views with regard to one particular expiation. He is quoted by ŚB., because this text wants to demonstrate that the sitting down of the cow does not need an expiation. Āruṇi gives a cosmic interpretation of the rite (cf. JB. 1, 51 and ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 2 f.) in which the identification of heaven and cow, wind and calf, earth and *agnihotrasthālī*, implies that the cow and the calf cannot get lost (*kva hy asau/eṣa naśyet*), the *agnihotrasthālī* cannot break (*kva hīyam bhidyeta*) and the sitting down of the cow brings down heaven and its fortune in the form of rain. JB. quotes a somewhat different version of Āruṇi's views (which deal with three subjects: the calf is lost; the milk is spilt; the cow sits down), but selects the first mentioned accident (the loss of the calf) as the central subject.

The JB. passage forms a rather careless adaptation and borrowing from the ŚB. version. The statement *no vā evamvido 'gnihotrī duhyamāno-paviśati* has to be taken as an automatic continuation of the argumentation *na . . . agnihotrīvatso naśyati . . . no . . . agnihotraṁ duhyamānam skandati* since the heaven-cow can sit down by pouring down rain. Introducing the (doubtful) expiation *yad . . . agnihotrīvatso naśyet* with the formal question *kim tatra karma kā prāyaścittiḥ* the JB. passage ends without describing a karman (there is in fact no karman since this expiation does not exist). Apparently the JB. redactor who borrowed from ŚB. was not a ritualist with interest in the practical aspects.

The second paragraph deals with the accident that the cow milks blood. This expiation does not occur in any other brāhmaṇa except ŚB. (12, 4, 2, 1), where it also comes after the sitting down (and lowing) of the cow, but introduces a new brāhmaṇa which deals with the falling of impurities into the milk. In its present form the expiation hardly seems to be the original. It is connected with the preceding expiations by the explanation of the accident (the cow foresees evil for the sacrificer). Perhaps originally the sitting down of the cow was the only token of distress (compare *sīdati* and its compounds meaning "to sit down", "to be distressed"). AB. 7, 3, 3 transfers this explanation to the lowing of the cow. Since milking blood is not a conscious action of the cow (such as sitting down or lowing) one may assume that it does not express the feelings of the cow on the sacrificer's future and that consequently the passage *tām tasyām āhutyām brāhmaṇāya dadyād . . . ārtim evāsmims tat*

pāpmānam pratimuñcati seems to have been taken by the author of ŚB. from ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 9, where *mutatis mutandis* it forms the (rejected) view of *eke* (the Taitt.) on the sitting down of the cow. The JB. version here reads . . . *pratidrśya duhe yā lohitaṁ duhe* (= ŚB.), whereas 1, 58 the TB. turn of phrase (. . . *pratidrśyopaviśati yasyāgnihotrī duhyamāno-paviśati*) is followed.

Not only is the interpretation of the accident secondary, but the expiation itself also seems to show traces of an incoherent treatment. It may be useful first to establish the meaning of this blood in the milk. Evidently this expiation has no relation to the sitting down of the cow (only the fact that the cow has to be given away may have formed a link), but should be regarded as a defilement of the milk. Therefore it introduces in ŚB. a new brāhmaṇa on the falling of impurities into the milk. As blood in the milk is not an ordinary impurity (it also concerns the cow), special measures have to be taken. The milk is cooked on the *anvāhāryapacana* (= *dakṣiṇāgni*), which is surrounded. This implies that this milk is dangerous and that it is destined for demons or evil powers. On the use of the *dakṣiṇāgni* for offerings to evil spirits see Keith, *Religion and Philosophy*, p. 288; for the removal of hostile influences by means of mats etc. see o.c., p. 383 (here the sacrificial fire is not surrounded in order to keep off the demons from the oblation, but in order to keep the evil influence within the surrounded place). The evil spirits are allowed to have offerings of blood (Keith, o.c., p. 241). While performing these sacrifices one should inaudibly mention the names of these spirits (AB. 2, 7; compare ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 1 *tūṣṇīm . . . aniruktam*, where a different explanation is given). KSS. 25, 2, 2 does not state that one should offer *tūṣṇīm*, but refers to Rudra (*rudrāya hūtvā*; cf. BhārSS. 9, 8, 7 *agnaye rudravate svāhā iti juhuyāt*). Rudra is the god who together with his hosts attacks the cattle. The blood in the milk is the manifestation of a disease caused by Rudra, whose anger is appeased by this offering. Blood is, on the other hand, one of the offerings made to Rudra's hosts. See Keith, o.c., p. 145: "The bloody entrails of the victim are made over to his (sc. Rudra's) hosts, which attack men and beast with disease and death, in order to avert their anger".

One may doubt whether *vyutkrāmatety uktvā* should mean that the sacrificer and others are addressed, as the commentary on ĀpSS. 9, 5, 5, the *Śrautakośa* (I, p. 156) and, perhaps, also Caland (translating ĀpSS. l.c. "schreitet hinaus") take it. The same imperative is found ŚB. 3, 9, 2, 13, where at the end of the animal sacrifice the priest carries round the Vasatvārī water (which according to ŚB. 3, 9, 2, 16 is used for protection and for repelling the evil spirits) and says (thrice) *vyutkrāmata* "disperse" (Eggeling). Apparently the evil spirits are addressed. It is highly doubtful whether *vyutkrām-* ever means "hinausschreiten". The verb either denotes the going apart of things or persons originally belonging together (cf. MS. 4, 1, 10: 14. 4 f. *prthivyā vai medhyam cāmedhyam ca vyudakrāmat prācīnam medhyam udakrāmat . . . etc.*) or the dispersing in all directions. The later meaning especially applies to demons, as may appear from VādhS. 4, 8 (A.O. 6, p. 105 f.) *te 'nyajanā abruvann: asmān (api paśau*

anvābhajataṃ iti; tāt ū) vadhyena (ca lohiteṇa) ca nirabhājayatām; tasmāt paśāv ūvadhyam ca lohitaṃ ca na kurvanti; sa yam dviṣyāt tam ūvadhyena ca lohiteṇa (ca) manasā samajyāthainam etebhyo 'nyajanebhyah samprayacchet, tasya prāṇair vyutkrāṃanti.

In the expiation of ŚB. and JB. Rudra and his hosts are not mentioned. Moreover the injunction *vyutkrāmata* is hardly correct before the cooking of the milk if our interpretation is right. That the offering is made *tūṣṇīm* (i.e. without mentioning the name of the gods or powers to whom the oblation is dedicated) is easily understood in the case of Rudras, Rakṣasas etc. (cf. AB. 2, 7). The explanation of *tūṣṇīm* in ŚB., however, is not convincing in the context and may have been taken from ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 7. It may be concluded that this expiation, though first occurring in ŚB., did not originate with this brāhmaṇa (or JB.). For this expiation see further KŚS. 25, 2, 2 and the younger Taitt., of which BhārṢS. (9, 8, 7) has an offering with *agnaye rudravate svāhā*, whereas the later Āp. (9, 5, 5) and Hir. (15, 2, 4) sūtras agree more with ŚB. (and with JB.); the offering is made silently or with the three vyāhrtis. See also ĀśvŚS. 3, 11 (offering on the gārhapatyā).

60. Now they say: "If the calf of the agnihotra cow of this performer of a long sacrificial session, viz. the offerer of the agnihotra, should get lost,¹ what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" As to this now Āruṇi observed: "The agnihotra cow is heaven, her calf is the sun,² the agnihotra pot is this (earth).³ Surely the calf of the agnihotra cow of him who knows thus does not get lost, for where should it (the sun) get lost? Neither does the agnihotra milk of him who knows thus be spilt during milking, for it remains lying on this earth (= the agnihotra pot). Nor does the agnihotra cow of him who knows thus lie down while being milked. When that (heaven) heavily rains, they say of it: Oh, it has rained so much that it seemed to sit (or: to come) down on (the earth)."⁴

Now they further say: "If she should milk blood, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" If now she milks blood, she milks it, because she has seen evil for the sacrificer consisting of absence of livelihood. He should say: "Disperse" and order the anvāhāryāpacana fire to be screened. Having put that (bloody) milk on it and having made a stirring spoon he should boil it. On the spot⁵ (i.e. in the anvāhāryāpacana) he should pour it⁶ out silently. Prajāpati, one should know, is undefined⁶ and the agnihotra is sacred to Prajāpati. And also with these utterances "*bhūr, bhuvas, svar*". Now these utterances are expiations for all. So he makes expiation with this All.⁷

NOTES

¹ I take *naśyati* as "to get lost" instead of "to perish" (Eggeling). Cf. AB. 7, 9, 2 ff. *yadi kapālam . . yadi pavitraṃ . . yadi hiraṇyam naśyet* "If a pot-should . . the filter . . the gold be lost" (Keith). In this interpretation *kva* can have its usual meaning "where" (Eggeling: "how").

² Just as the calf makes the milk flow, so the sun (JB.) or the wind (ŚB.) brings about rain. For the connection between sun and rain see Lüders, *Varuṇa*, p. 308 ff.

³ For the identification of the earth and the agnihotrasthālī (*iyam evāgnihotrasthālī*) and its consequences (*no vā evamvido 'gnihotraṃ duhyamānam skandaty asyām hy eva pratitiṣṭhati*; not found in the ŚB. parallel) one may perhaps compare KS. 6, 3: 51. 18 ff. *yā sthāly agnihotratapani tayā duhyād iyam vai sā na vā* (emendation Caland, *Festschrift Ernst Kuhn*, p. 69) *imām iha nehātishandaty anayaivopasidati tad asyāskannam bhavati* and MS. 1, 8, 3: 118. 1 f. *sthālyā duhaty anayā vā etad upasidanti nahimam ito netaḥ skandaty askannatvāya*.

⁴ Oertel: *yathā vā eṣa suvṛṣṭam varṣaty abhiniṣady eva tathāvarṣid ity enām āhuḥ*. Crit. ed.: *yadā vā eṣa susṛṣṭam varṣaty abhiniṣady eva batāvarṣid ity enām āhuḥ*. Here the ŚB. version is completely different. For the undoubtedly correct reading *suvṛṣṭam* compare TS. 1, 6, 10, 5 *yathā vai parjanyaḥ suvṛṣṭam varṣaty evam yajño yajamānāya varṣati*; TB. 3, 11, 10, 3 *yathā vai parjanyaḥ suvṛṣṭam vṛṣtvā . .* See also Wackernagel-Debrunner, *Altind. Grammatik* II, 2, p. 580. The quoted parallels seem to support Oertel's conjecture *yathā*. If one assumes a comparison, *evam* (for *eva*) may be preferred to *tathā* (see TS. 1, 6, 10, 5). The interjection *bata* (thus most mss. read) and the use of the aorist, however, seem to be contrary to such an interpretation. Therefore *yadā* (and *bata*) should be retained. In a heavy rainfall heaven (*eṣa* refers to a fem. *dyauḥ*) seems to be coming down on earth (*abhiniṣadī*); at least the downpour may have been described so in the colloquial (note the interjection *bata*) speech. One may also read *abhiniṣadyeva*. See M.-W. s.v. *bata*: "... originally placed after the leading word at the beginning of a sentence, or only separated from it by *iva*". In the context *iva* "so to say" is quite suitable after the rather strong expression *abhiniṣadya*.

⁵ *tad tad eva* (crit. ed.: *evam sarveṣu koṣeṣu*) is obviously correct (Oertel: *tad eva*) since the first *tad* refers to the milk (cf. *tad adhiṣṭīya . . śrapayet*) and the second is an adverb (cf. ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 8 *tad evopaviṣet*; 12, 4, 2, 5 *tad evainad abhiparyādhāya viṣyandayet*).

⁶ Before this clause *aniruktam* must have dropped out or been omitted by the compiler of JB., as appears from the ŚB. version. On *anirukta*-, silence and Prajāpati see Lokesh Chandra, *Gavāmāyana*, p. 26, n. 12 (on JB. 2, 12). See also Renou & Silburn, *Sarup Comm. Volume* (1954), p. 68-79 and Varenne, *La Mahā Nārāyaṇa Upaṇiṣad* II (Paris 1960), p. 57.

⁷ Here the ŚB. version is different: *sarvaṃ vā aniruktam tad anena sarveṇa prāyaścittim kurute*. Perhaps JB. has replaced this passage by *atho bhūr bhuvas svar iti . .* etc. taken from 1, 53 (= ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 8), where similarly *tad anena sarveṇa prāyaścittim kurute* is found. Why should one pour out *tūṣṇīm* as well as (*atho*) with the three vyāhrtis? Or should *atho* be taken as "but also (according to others)", i.e. as *athavā* (cf. ĀpŚS. 9, 5, 5)?

6I. The extinction of the fires

This section dealing with the extinction of the āhavanīya or the gārhapatya starts a series of expiations (I, 61-65) which refer to the fires, their extinction, fusion, being taken out too late. Apparently JB. regards these five chapters as a unity since I, 62; 63 and 64 are introduced at the end of the preceding chapter by *atho khalv āhuh*. The independent, new expiation of the extinction of the fires is, remarkably enough, also announced at the end of JB. I, 60 (in Oertel's edition, however, *atho khalv āhuh* is missing) and not introduced by *tad āhur yad etasya dīrgha-satrinah* . . There is, however, no relation between the chapters 60 and 61.

The beginning of this section seems to be corrupt. It starts with *yad agnayo 'nugaccheyuh kim tatra karma kā prāyaścittir iti* and continues without specifying a fire *tam u haika ulmukād eva nirmanthanti*. From the parallel ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 3 appears that the gārhapatya is meant. There is obviously an omission (see also Oertel, o.c., p. 342, n. 1). JB. I, 61 started with *yad agnayo 'nugaccheyuh* by way of introduction to this section which deals with the extinction of the (two) fires in several situations. The specification of the first expiation, the extinction of the gārhapatya, was left out (perhaps on account of the fact that the extinction of the gārhapatya again occurs in the third paragraph).

The order of the expiations dealing with the extinction of the fires is different in ŚB. This text starts a new brāhmaṇa with the extinction of the fire (i.e. the āhavanīya) after the first oblation has been offered; an expiation which, coming after *srucy unnītam amedhyam āpadyeta / avavarṣet* (ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 9-10), suits the chronological arrangement of the ŚB. prāyaścittis. JB., in spite of its systematical arrangement, deals with this expiation at the end of I, 56 (after the falling of rain on the milk). The next paragraph in ŚB. (12, 4, 3, 2) again concerns the extinction of the āhavanīya; in this case before the oblation has been offered (*purāgnihoṭrād*). Here the strictly chronological order is no longer observed by ŚB., which continues with the extinction of the gārhapatya (12, 4, 3, 3), an accident taking place either before the rite has started with the transference of fire to the āhavanīya or after the conclusion of the sacrifice, when the āhavanīya has already gone out. For JB., which had transferred the extinction of the āhavanīya *pūrvasyām āhuta hutāyām* to I, 56, there was no reason to deal first with the extinction of the āhavanīya *purāgnihoṭrād* (as was done in ŚB., where the two expiations concerning the āhavanīya are placed together). Consequently it starts with the gārhapatya and thereafter deals with the āhavanīya (which is taken out of the gārhapatya). The rest of this chapter runs parallel to ŚB. (12, 4, 3, 6-10; 12, 4, 4, 1) with this difference that the JB. version of ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 4-5 has been transferred to the expiations for the fusion of the fires (JB. I, 65).

First the text mentions the expiation of *eke* who again churn out the

gārhapatya from a charred *ulmuka* (firebrand). This may refer to MS. I, 8, 9: 130. I f. *yasyāgnir anugacchet tebhya evāvakṣāṇebhyo 'dhi manthitavyas tad enam svād yoneh prajanayati*. The *Srautakośa* (Sanskrit Section) I, p. 95 f. is wrong in connecting ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 3, in the section *ahute 'gnihotre 'paro 'gnir anugacchet* with MS. I, 8, 8 and KS. 6, 6 (without mentioning JB. I, 61, the closest parallel) and MS. I, 8, 9: 130. I ff. with several passages which deal with the extinction of the āhavanīya. ŚB. and JB., rejecting this expiation, argue that in order to procure fire from this firebrand one has two possibilities. Either one takes the firebrand away from the gārhapatya (an apparently inadmissible action because it brings about the loss of something belonging to that fire) or one cuts off a piece from it. This would imply that the firebrand is preserved, but at the cost of the equally dangerous cutting, which makes an incision and endangers the wholeness and continuity of the rite. The difference between the expiation found in JB. and ŚB. (the fire is churned in the firedrill out of charcoal scraped from a charred firebrand) and the one rejected is that there is nothing taken away or cut off. The charcoal is scraped from the firebrand (ŚB. reads *ulmukād āngāram ādāya*; JB. *ulmukād apacchīdya* seems to be less original since it does not clearly avoid the idea of cutting) and completely merges in the newly produced fire during the churning. Producing the fire from a firebrand or from a part of it would imply that this wood is left after the fire has been churned out, i.e. that something has been taken away which keeps existing outside the fire.

Most texts agree that the āhavanīya, if it goes out, may again be taken out (cf., however, TS. 2, 2, 4, 7) and that the gārhapatya may again be churned out, provided that the āhavanīya has not yet been taken out. If the āhavanīya is (still) burning, several expiations are prescribed, most of which are discussed and criticized in the comparatively late brāhmaṇas ŚB. and JB. Remarkably enough AB. 7, 5, 8 mentions and rejects the same four expiations as ŚB. (and JB.) and discusses them in the same order. ŚB. and AB., however, do not criticize each other's expiation. TB. I, 4, 4, 7 disapproves of three prāyaścittis proposed in connection with the extinction of the gārhapatya, but its own expiation (*āhavanīyam udvāpya gārhapatyam manthet*) is rejected by AB. as well as ŚB.

The following expiations are discussed by ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 6 ff. and JB.: a) From the āhavanīya (forming the new gārhapatya) a new āhavanīya is taken out: MS. I, 8, 8: 128. 4 and (in case of haste) KS. 6, 6: 55. 8. This is rejected by KS. itself and by TB. (*vāstavyam agnim upāṣita, rudro 'sya paśūn ghātukaḥ syāt*); AB. (*prāyatanāc cyaveta*); ŚB./JB. The JB. version omits the argumentation of the *eke* (*prānā vā agnayaḥ . . iti vadantaḥ*) and thereby obscures its objection against this expiation. JB. has rather carelessly borrowed from ŚB., but not only from that text. The argument of AB. (*prāyatanāc cyaveta*) has been applied by JB. to the next expiation (*pra nvā ayam asyai pratiṣṭhāyā acyoṣṭa*; compare in a different context VādhS. 4, 16, A.O. 6, p. 113: *prāyatanād acyoṣṭa-pratiṣṭhito bhaviṣyati*). b) From the āhavanīya fire is taken back to the

gārhapatya. AB. (*asuravad yajñam tanvita*) and ŚB./JB. disapprove of this expiation (without source). The argumentation of ŚB. seems to have been taken from ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 7 (*svargyam vā etad yad agnihotram . .*), where it is more suitable since it refers to the oblation. JB. wrongly connects the argumentation of AB. from the preceding expiation with this prāyaścitti, in which the gārhapatya is not left at all. c) The gārhapatya is again churned out. TB. (*vicchindyāt. bhrātrvyam asmai janayet*); AB. (*bhrātrvyam yajamānasya janayet*) and ŚB./JB. criticize this unknown source. d) The āhavanīya is extinguished and the gārhapatya churned out anew: KS. 6, 6: 55. 7 and TB. 1, 4, 4, 7. This expiation is rejected by AB. (*yad anugamayet prāṇo yajamānam jahyāt*) and ŚB./JB. e) One moves to another place, churns out the fire there and returns the next day: KS. 6, 6: 55. 9 ff. *anyatraivāvasāyāgnim mathitvoddhṛtya juhuyāt saiva tatra prāyaścittis tataś śvo 'gnaye tapasvate . .* This is followed by ŚB./JB. The own expiation of AB. (*sarvam evainam saha-bhasmānam samopya gārhapatyāyatane nidhāyātha prāñcam āhavanīyam uddharet*; cf. GB. 1, 3, 13 *sabhasmakam āhavanīyam . . gārhapatyāyatane pratiṣṭhāpya tata āhavanīyam prāñīya . .*), remarkably enough, is not commented upon by ŚB. On the other hand AB. (as well as TB.) is silent on the expiation of KS., which is adopted by ŚB./JB. So the relation between the texts dealing with these expiations is not perfectly clear, but one may assume that the chronological order is: KS. (MS.) — TB. — AB. — ŚB. — JB. Apparently the treatment of this expiation in MS. is corrupt. The extinction of the gārhapatya and the āhavanīya seem to have been confused. In case the gārhapatya goes out (after the *uddharana* of the āhavanīya), an expiation is prescribed which is even criticized by KS. The expiation for the extinction of the āhavanīya has been extended with a passage which seems to refer to the gārhapatya. The mantra *ita eva prathamam jajñe . .* (MS. 1, 8, 8: 127. 10 f.) is hardly suitable after the renewed taking out of the āhavanīya, but refers to new churning out of the gārhapatya from the remains of the old fire (see TB. 1, 4, 4, 8). The formula *iṣe rāye ramaśva* is found in the same context in TB., but is connected with the renewed taking out of the āhavanīya in MS.

Among the sūtras BŚS. 14, 24 (Śāliki's view) follows TB., whereas 23, 8 (Baudhāyana's view) agrees with AB. The younger Taitt. have taken this expiation partly from KS. and MS. (see Caland's translation of ĀpŚS. 9, 1, 1 ff.). BhārŚS. 9, 12, 10 — 9, 13, 2 almost completely agrees with MS. 1, 8, 8: 127. 9 ff. *athābhimantrayeta ita eva prathamam jajñe . . aṣṭākāpālam nirvaped vāruṇam yavamayaṁ cārum*). The difference, however, is that the passage in MS. is introduced by *yasyāhute 'gnihotre pūrvo 'gnir anugacched* and followed by *yasyāhute 'gnihotre pūrvo 'gnir anugacchet*. The sūtra passage begins with *yadi sāyam ahute 'gnihotre 'paro 'gnir anugacchet pūrvam agnim anvasāya tata eva prāñcam uddhṛtya juhuyāt* (BhārŚS. 9, 12, 9; cf. MS. 1, 8, 8: 128. 3 ff. *yasyāhute 'gnihotre 'paro 'gnir anugacchet tata eva prāñcam uddhṛtyānvasāyāgnihotram juhuyād athābhimantrayeta . .*). It is evident that the MS. passage is corrupt and that after *athābhimantrayeta* in the expiation for the ex-

inction of the gārhapatya (MS. 1, 8, 8: 128. 4 f.) should come the mantra *ita eva prathamam jajñe . .* etc. in accordance with BhārŚS. This mantra, quoted by BhārŚS. 9, 11, 7 as *itaḥ prathamam jajñe* (instead of *ita eva . .*), occurs TS. 2, 2, 4, 7 (likewise reading *itaḥ prathamam*) in connection with the churning of a new fire in case the āhavanīya has gone out. However, there seems to be no relation with the corrupt passage in MS. (TS. rejects the expiation of MS. and KS. which prescribe that the āhavanīya should be taken out anew). MŚS. 3, 3, 1 follows the MS. text as transmitted to us (miss van Gelder's rendering of *yasyāhute 'gnihotre* "after the agnihotra oblation" has to be corrected into "before the oblation has been offered"), but for the extinction of the gārhapatya it adopts the expiation of KS. (MŚS. 3, 3, 2). Notice that *sāyamprātara juhuyāc chvo bhūte . .* etc. confirms our interpretation of *ubhayatorātram/ abhitorātram* (JB./ŚB.) in n. 18. ĀśvŚS. 3, 12 f. and KŚS. 25, 3, 4 ff. do not follow their own brāhmaṇa. Caland, ĀpŚS. 9, 9, 1, n. 1 seems to suggest that ĀśvŚS. may have borrowed from ĀpŚS.: "Vor den Spruch des TBr. *iṣe rāyai* fügt Āp. die Worte *agne samrād* ein, so hat auch (nach ihm?) Āśv.". Since Bhār. does not have this insertion and Āp. must have taken these words from another text, the reverse may be equally possible. AthPr. 1, 5 (extinction of the gārhapatya) has been borrowed from AB.; AthPr. 5, 1 (corrupt) follows several schools of YV. The extinction of the āhavanīya, which has been omitted by TB. and for which the younger Taitt. have taken their expiation from KS., is treated by BŚS. 13, 7 in accordance with the expiation of TS. 2, 2, 3, 7 f. BŚS. 27, 11 accepts the expiation which had been rejected by TS.

61. "If the fires should go out, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Now some churn it out from a firebrand, arguing: "Wherefrom in the last resort it gets lost to man, that is the point whence he strives after its expiation".¹ But he should not consider it thus. For² (in that case) he should go and take away a firebrand from that (fire) or cut off something from a firebrand.³ He should proceed in this way. Having planed⁴ something from a firebrand he should tear it up⁵ on the fire-stick (i.e. in the hole of the lower *arāṇi*). Surely⁶ he reaches the object in view of which one churns (the fire) from a firebrand⁷ as well as that in view of which (one churns it) in the fire-stick.

Now they further say: "If the āhavanīya after being taken out (from the gārhapatya) should be extinguished, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" There is, forsooth, no real extinction of that fire,⁸ as long as the gārhapatya does not go out. Even if it should go out many⁹ times, he should again and again take it out. That is the rite in that case.

Now they further say: "If the gārhapatya should become extinct

after the āhavanīya has been taken out, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Now some take it (i.e. the new fire) out from that same (āhavanīya) forward. But he should not do it thus. If some one¹⁰ were to say in that case "Surely this one has expelled the sacrificer's lifebreaths forward.¹¹ This sacrificer will die", it would come to pass so.

Now some take it (i.e. the new gārhapatya) back from that same (āhavanīya), arguing: "The gārhapatya is the (forward) exhalation, the āhavanīya the (backward) inhalation. These two in their interactive association of ex- and inhalation¹² eat food".¹³ But on the other hand the gārhapatya is also the house and the house is the point of support. If some one were to say of him in that case "This one has fallen from his point of support. This sacrificer will die", it would come to pass so.

Now some having churned it¹⁴ (i.e. the new gārhapatya) on the (old) gārhapatya lay (a firewood from the new gārhapatya) on (the old āhavanīya which is still burning). But he should not do it thus. If some one were to say in that case "He has produced a (new) fire over¹⁵ a (still existing) fire. Soon a hostile rival will be produced for him", it would come to pass so.

Now some churn it out (anew) after having extinguished (the āhavanīya). But he should not do it thus. If some one were to say in that case¹⁶ "He has even caused to expire what was left him. No heir will remain to him", it would come to pass so.

He should proceed in this way: He should lift (the fires) on the two fire-sticks (with the formulas:) "This is thy proper womb, whence born thou didst shine. Knowing it, O Agni, mount it and increase our wealth" or¹⁷ "and promote our songs of praise". Having broken up his place of sacrifice and moved to another place he should stay there a night and offer. In this new place there is offered by him before and after the night¹⁸ and he does not incur any disapprobation.¹⁹

At daybreak having taken out the ashes and smeared (the fire-places) around with a lump of cow-dung he should set up his fires in the usual way. This is the rite in that case.

Now they further say: "If on his āhavanīya, when it has not been taken out —

NOTES

¹ Eggeling translates the ŚB. parallel (12, 4, 3, 3) *yato vai puruṣasyāntato naśyati tato vai sa tasya prāyaścittim icchate* "Whereby man's (body) is

destroyed in the end, it is therefrom he desires the expiation of this (mishap)". The ellipse of "body" is harsh (are there any parallels for such an ellipse?) and the motivation of the expiation hardly makes sense. The reason why one churns out fire from the firebrand (*ulmuka*) is that one tries to preserve the continuity of the sacrifice. One expiates from the very point where the accident has taken place (compare the expiation of JB. 1, 54, where milk is ladled out on the spot where milk has been spilt). The *ulmuka* mentioned here is a partly charred firebrand from the extinguished gārhapatya. It is the vanishing-point of the fire. From the point where the fire escapes man (*puruṣasya*; JB. *mānuṣyasya*; a *gen. pro dat.*) ultimately, in the last resort (*antataḥ*), therefrom he wishes to make an expiation. One may also assume a more general utterance: "Wherefrom man loses something from that point he starts his expiation".

² After the rejection (*tad u tathā na kuryāt*) of the expiation of *eke* the text continues according to Eggeling's translation of ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 3 with the own view of the brāhmaṇa: *ulmukam ha vai vādāya careyur ulmukasya vāvavraṣcam ittham eva kuryād ulmukād āngāram ādāya tam aranyor abhivimathniyād* "but let them proceed by taking either a firebrand or a piece from a firebrand; — let him do it in this way: — having taken a coal from a firebrand, let him crumble it on the two churning-sticks". The ample use of punctuation marks looks suspicious. Moreover the alternation of plural (*eke* .. *manthanti*), singular (*na kuryāt*), plural (*careyur*) and singular (*ittham eva kuryāt*) indicates that *careyur* does not refer to the own ŚB. view. The stock pattern of discussions with other schools in these prāyaścittis is the following: a) First comes the view of the others (ŚB. *tad dhaike, tam/tām haike*; JB. *tad/tam/tām u haike* ..). b) This is followed by the rejection of this view (*tad u tathā na kuryāt*). In JB. the stock phrase sometimes is *tad u tathā na vidyāt* if referring to a theory (*manyante* or *iti vadantaḥ*) rather than to a practice. ŚB. once has *tan nādrīyeta* in a reaction on the criticism of others (*tad dhaike upavalhante*), where JB. again has *tad u tathā na vidyāt*. c) Then comes the argumentation of the rejection (*yo ha tatra brūyāt* ..; *yo hainaṁ tatra brūyāt* ..). The stereotyped turn of phrase is not always used in this argumentation; see e.g. JB. 1, 55; 57. d) Only then comes the brāhmaṇa's own prescript (almost invariably introduced by *ittham eva kuryāt*). We must conclude that *ulmukam ha vai vādāya careyur ulmukasya vāvavraṣcam* (standing between *tad u tathā na kuryāt* and *ittham eva kuryāt*) forms the argumentation of the rejection. This is also confirmed by JB. (*ulmukam hy eva tata ādāya cared ulmukasya vāvavraṣcam*), which has replaced the less distinctly explicative particle *vai* by *hi* (and the plural by the equally correct singular caret: "he would ..", sc. "if he would act like the *eke*"). For the use of *vai* in these argumentations see ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 8 *tad u tan nādrīyeta. yadā vā etad* .. (cf. JB. 1, 54); JB. 1, 57 *tad u tathā na vidyān na vai pretasya* .. Simply translating *vai* by "for" would, however, be incorrect (see Caland, *A.O.* 2, p. 28). The connotation seems to be "now (one should know that)". [After having sent the manuscript to the press I now discover that Minard, *Trois Énigmes* I, § 132-138 deals with the scheme of the "dialectique du blâme". My treatment of this subject which refers to a special sub-type of discussions may amplify Minard's well-founded conclusions, which are especially important with regard to the function of *eva* (marking the "réaffirmation de la doctrine correcte" as in the present passage)]

³ *vāvavraṣcam* is not a noun (Eggeling: "piece"; cf. also Wackernagel-Debrunner, *Altind. Grammatik*; Index Hauschild, s.v.), but a gerund in *-am*

(cf. ŚB. II, 6, 1, 3 *saṃvraścam*), here construed with a partitive genitive (*ulmukasya*). For *carati* with a gerund (*ādāya*) see Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 408, for *carati* with *avavraścam* see o.c., p. 404. See also Minard, *Trois Enigmes* II, p. 60 ff. on these constructions.

⁴ Instead of *ulmukād evāpacchidyā* the ŚB. version has *ulmukād angāram ādāya*, which proves that *apacchid-* denotes the planing or scratching of (a very thin chip of) charcoal from the firewood.

⁵ JB. reads *abhivimanthet*, ŚB. *abhivimathniyāt*. Miss Narten, "Das vedische Verbum math", *I.I.J.* 4, pp. 121-135 has proved that we should assume two formally as well as semasiologically different verbs: *manth-* "to churn" and *math-* "to snatch, rob". The compounded verb *vi-math-* (occurring only in the plural) means "auseinanderreißen, auseinanderreissend rauben"; *abhivimath-* is only found in the present ŚB. passage (12, 4, 3, 3), where Miss Narten translates *ulmukād angāram ādāya tam aranyor abhivimathniyāt* "man soll aus einem Feuerbrand eine Kohle nehmen und diese auf die zwei Reibhölzer hin auseinanderreißen" (o.c., p. 130). Apparently JB. in borrowing this passage from ŚB. has replaced the verb *abhivimath-* by *abhivimanth-* (*vimanth-* does not occur in Vedic texts; all compounded forms with *vi-* are from *math-*). The charcoal is not crumbled by the upper churning stick, but it is torn up on the fire-drill by the hands of the priest before the churning of the fire.

⁶ Read with all mss. *upāha tam* instead of *upā ha tam*. See Hoffmann, "Textkritisches zum Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa", *I.I.J.* 4, p. 7 referring to Delbrück, *Altind. Syntax*, p. 520 for the use of this particle *aha*.

⁷ Since there does not seem to be any parallel for a noun *mathyā* and an ellipse of a feminine noun is excluded, one should perhaps emend with Oertel (and the ŚB. version) to *ulmukamathya* (sc. *agnau*).

⁸ The transmitted text cannot be correct. Either *bhavati* should be emended to *bhavatu* or *anugato* to *ananugato*. ("Let it be extinguished, (there is no problem) as long as the gārhapatya does not go out"; "It is not (really) extinguished, as long as the gārhapatya does not go out").

⁹ JB. replaces *śatam eva kṛtvāḥ* (ŚB.) by *bahv iva kṛtvāḥ*. On *iva* = *eva* see Minard, *Trois Enigmes* I, § 307. This equation is rejected by D. Schrapel, *Untersuchung der Partikel iva* .. (thesis Marburg 1970), whose remark "Anstelle des schwierigen *iva* konnte nur zu leicht das — vermeintlich — bequemere *evā* treten" does not apply here, since JB. (*iva*) borrows from ŚB. (*eva*).

¹⁰ Oertel and Raghu Vira have adopted the *lectio difficilior* *yo 'nga* instead of *yo ha* (the reading of some mss. and the parallel clauses). As *yo 'nga* is a frequent combination in the *samhitās*, but has a rather different meaning here ("just he who; only he who"), and as this combination is not found in Vedic prose, one should retain the *lectio faciliior* *yo ha* and take *yo 'nga* as a corruption.

¹¹ *prāco nvā ayam yajamānasya prāṇān prārautsīt* (JB. *prāvṛkṣat*) "Surely, this one has obstructed the forward vital airs" (Eggeling, who observes in a note: "? Or, has forced them forward"). E.'s latter interpretation should be adopted, since it agrees more with the actual performance of the expiation. The fires are the sacrificer's breaths (see *Agn. a. Prāṇāgn.*, ch. III), the *vihāra* in which they are arranged is his body. By moving these fires/breaths forward the āhavanīya is excluded from the old *vihāra*/body in a forward direction, i.e. one drives the *prāṇāḥ* out of the sacrificer and kills him. For the difficult *pravṛj-* see also Section 45-46, n. 15. The preverb *pra-* not only implies "forward", but also "outward" (cf. *prāṇa-* "out-breathing"). So

pravṛj- perhaps means "to keep out of someone or something; to exclude something; to exclude someone from something".

¹² Corresponding to JB. *prāṇāpānau* ŚB. has *prāṇodānau* (see also Section 58-59, n. 3). Here the gārhapatya is equated with *prāṇa*, because this fire is taken out forward (*pra-*) to the āhavanīya. The latter fire being identical with the inbreathing or backward breathing (*apāna/udāna*) is therefore allowed to be taken out back to the gārhapatya.

¹³ Oertel's conjecture *atteti* was rightly rejected by Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 64. The two fires in their association (*saṃvidānau*) as expiration and inhalation "eat food", i.e. they form a (breathing) living being (presumably the sacrificer), which remains alive and prospers through this co-operation, this breathing out and in, this moving forward and backward of the fires. The expression "to eat food" only means "to remain alive" (see Minard, *Trois Enigmes* II, § 403 a).

¹⁴ For *evam avadhitoṣasamādadhati* (thus the crit. ed. without any v.l.), which was also conjectured by Oertel (mss. A, B *adhito*, C *apadhito*), read with Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 64 *eva mathihopa*°, apparently a misprint for *mathitopa*°. The new gārhapatya (as in the preceding expiations expressed by *tam*) is churned out on the old gārhapatya fireplace (*gārhapatye*) and a firewood from the new gārhapatya is put on the still burning āhavanīya (*upasamādadhati*) by way of renewed *uddharana*. Note the ellipsis of the object.

¹⁵ JB. *agnāv adhy agnim ajiṇat kṣipre 'sya dviṣan bhrātrvyo janiṣyate*; ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 8 *agner nvā ayam adhi dviṣantam bhrātrvyam ajiṇata kṣipre 'sya dviṣan bhrātrvyo janiṣyate* "Surely, this one has raised a spiteful enemy from out of the fire .." (Eggeling, who observes in a note: "Viz. inasmuch as he takes out a new āhavanīya from the newly kindled Gārhapatya, and puts it on the still burning āhavanīya fire"). Eggeling's interpretation of the abl. *agneḥ*, however, remains obscure, the more so as *ajiṇata* obviously refers to the churning out of the new gārhapatya. Moreover the JB. version does not support Eggeling's translation. Because JB. reads *tam .. gārhapatya eva mathitvā* and *agnāv adhy agnim ajiṇat* one might assume that the old and the new gārhapatya should be *bhrātrvyā*, but the parallel TB. 1, 4, 4, 7 (*yad āhavanīyam anudvāpya gārhapatyaṃ manthet, vicchindāt, bhrātrvyam asmai janayet*) proves that the āhavanīya and the new gārhapatya are the rivals. This rivalry does not only arise through the putting of new fire on the āhavanīya (as Eggeling assumes), but already through the production as such (*ajiṇata*) of the new fire while the old is still present. The āhavanīya is with respect to its fire identical to the extinguished gārhapatya. Therefore *adhi* with the loc. (JB.) or the abl. (ŚB.) should be interpreted as "over, on, above, in addition to". The ŚB. version then runs: "On an (existing) fire he has produced a rivalling (fire)".

¹⁶ The usual ŚB. equivalent *yo hainam tatra brūyāt* is missing in the transmitted ŚB. text (as was also observed by Eggeling), which shows that even the ŚB. text is not entirely trustworthy and that in incidental, less verifiable cases where the JB. version is superior, the ŚB. text may be simply corrupt.

¹⁷ Instead of *iti vāsa udavasāya* .. (thus Oertel and the crit. ed.) read with Caland, *W.Z.K.M.* 28, p. 64 *iti vā. sa udavasāya* ..: "Aus vā geht hervor, dass der letzte Pada des Spruches nach der Überlieferung des Rk- [i.e. *athā no vardhayā giraḥ*. RV. 3, 29, 10] oder des Yajurveda [i.e. *athā no vardhayā rayim*, VS. 3, 14; TS. 1, 5, 5, 2 and other texts] sein kann".

¹⁸ Instead of *ubhayatorātram* ŚB. reads *abhitorātram*, which Eggeling translates by "towards night". See also M.-W., s.v. *abhitorātram*: "near (i.e.

either just at the beginning or end of) the night". As appears from the JB. version *abhitorātram* means "on both sides of the night, i.e. before and after the night". The agnihotra, though being performed every morning and evening, is regarded as consisting of two parts, the evening and the morning agnihotra, which belong together.

¹⁹ Eggeling translates *na kām cana paricakṣām karoti* (ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 10) "he passes no censure on anyone", which does not make sense. The middle form *kurute* in JB. proves that the censure concerns oneself. The active in the ŚB. version may be rendered by "he does not give rise to criticism".

62-63. *The sun sets or rises over the āhavanīya, when it has not been taken out*

For these two expiations see especially ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 6-7. Note the peculiar division of the chapters in JB. By starting 62 and 63 in the midst of a clause (*abhy astam iyāt; abhyudiyāt*) the brāhmaṇa shows that these two chapters closely belong together. The versions of JB. and ŚB. more or less agree. JB. 1, 63, however, contains a sentence which seems to be inexplicable in the context (see n. 7) and the end of 1, 63 (from *atha haika āhur* ...) also has no parallel in the ŚB. version and has no relation at all with the prāyaścittis, but refers to the frequently occurring discussion on the proper time for the performance of the agnihotra. The expiations only deal with the incidental and accidental taking out of the fire after the time prescribed by the relevant schools. The view quoted by JB. refers to the intentional offering after sunrise.

Other parallels of these expiations are MS. 1, 8, 7: 125. 18 ff.; AB. 7, 12, 1 ff. and TB. 1, 4, 4, 1 ff. The oldest text (MS.) does not mention the gold. An expert brahmin takes out the fire and is followed by the officiant with the oblation if the sun has set (*yo brāhmaṇo bahuvi sa uddharet sarveṇaivainam brahmaṇoddharaty agnihotreṇānūdraved bhāgadheyenavainam pranayaty atho bhāgadheyenavainam samardhayati varo dakṣiṇā sarvata evainam digbhyo vareṇa cyāvayati*). The expiation for the extinction of the āhavanīya is quite similar: *agninā ca sahāgnihotreṇa coddaved bhāgadheyenavainam pranayaty atho bhāgadheyenavainam samardhayati* (MS. 1, 8, 8: 127. 8 ff.). See also KS. 6, 6: 55. 4 ff. ... *agninā pūrveṇoddruṭyāgnihotreṇānūddraved āhutyavainam cyāvayati yo brāhmaṇo bahuvi syāt sa uddharet sarveṇaivainam brahmaṇoddharati yat purā dhanam adāyī syāt tad dadyād acyutenaivainam cyāvayati*. The prāyaścitti of MS. hardly expiates the fact that the fire is taken out too late and evidently has been taken from the expiation for the extinction of the āhavanīya. AB. combines both expiations: ... *ādityo bhyudiyād vābhyastam iyād vā pranīto vā prāg ghomād upasāmyet* ... (7, 12, 1). See also AthPr. 5, 1, where, in a rather corrupt text, the two expiations shade off into each other. TB. (which does not deal with the extinction of the āhavanīya; for this expiation see TS. 2, 2, 4, 7, where the renewed taking out of the āhavanīya, however, is rejected) introduces the gold as a significant particularity, but for the rest follows the expiation of MS.: *darbheṇa hiranyam prabadhya purastād dharet athāgnim athāgnihotram ... yad agnim pūrvam haraty athāgnihotram bhāgadheyenavainam pranayati. brāhmaṇa ārṣeya uddharet. brāhmaṇo vai sarvā devatāḥ. sarvābhir evainam devatābhir uddharati*. The gold preceding the expert brahmin represents the sunlight which he ought to see (though in reality it has already disappeared). In the morning expiation (which does not occur in MS.) instead of gold *caturgrhītam ājyam* is carried in front of the expert brahmin (*etad vā agneḥ priyam dhāma yad ājyam priyeṇaivainam dhāmnā samardhayati*). Evidently this expiation is secondary since the

carrying in front has no function. AB. which follows TB. in the evening expiation (*hiranyam puraskṛtya sāyam uddharej jyotir vai śukram hiranyam . . tad eva taj jyotiḥ śukram paśyann uddharati*; cf. TB. *jyotir vai hiranyam jyotir evainam paśyann uddharati*) takes the next step and introduces silver as a counterpart of gold in the morning expiation. This silver being the representation of the night (*etad rātrirūpam*), i.e. of the situation that the sun still has not appeared, should not be carried before, in front of (or rather: for the eyes of, *puraskṛtya*) the one who takes out the fire, but should be hidden (*antardhāya prātar uddharet*; Keith' rendering "having interposed silver . ." is rather obscure) since the sunlight should be hidden at that moment. The next change has been made by ŚB., which has reinterpreted *purastād* (TB. "en tête", translation Dumont, o.c., p. 248) as "eastward". Consequently *purastād* could no longer be connected with the gold which represents the setting sun (going westward). So *darbhena hiranyam prabadhya purastād dharet* (TB.) was replaced by *haritam hiranyam darbhe prabadhya paścād dhartavai brūyāt*. Once again JB. borrowing from ŚB. also seems to have been influenced by TB. itself, the source of ŚB.: *sa darbheṇa suvarṇam hiranyam prabadhya paścād dharet*. The silver has been taken by ŚB. from AB. as the counterpart of gold for the morning expiation. Compare also *tac candramaso rūpam kriyate rātrir vai candramās tad rātre rūpam kriyate* (ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 7) with AB. 7, 12, 2 *rajatam antardhāya . . etad rātrirūpam*. This silver, however, is not concealed, but taken *purastād* (the counterpart of *parastād*), i.e. eastward. ŚB. has confused two aspects of the night in this expiation. The silver represents the moon according to this text. The moon, however, does not move eastward. The eastward movement refers to the nightly course of the sun, which does not set, but returns during the night to its place of departure in the east. See E. Sieg, "Der Nachtweg der Sonne", *Nachrichten K. G. W. Göttingen*, 1923, p. 1 ff. Every morning the fire should be taken out just before the eastward moving sun has reached its goal and is about to rise in the east. ŚB. and JB. prescribe the *caturgrhitam ājyam* for the morning as well as the evening expiation (TB. 1, 4, 4, 3 has only in the morning expiation *caturgrhitam ājyam purastād dharet*). The version of JB. omits the passage *brāhmaṇa ārṣeya uddhared . .* (found in ŚB. and based on TB.).

The Taitt. sūtras agree with TB., but HirŚS. 15, 2, 20 states *agnihotram pūrvam hareyuh athāgnim uddhareyuh api vā darbheṇa hiranyam prabadhya purastād dharet*. According to VaiŚS. 20, 12 f. first gold (sic), then butter and thereafter the agnihotra are taken to the āhavanīya at dawn. ĀśvŚS. 3, 12, 16 f. (*bahuvīd brāhmaṇo 'gnim prañayet darbhair hiranye 'grato hriyamāne . . . abhyudite caturgrhitam ājyam rajatam ca hiranyavad agrato hareyuh*) follows AB. as well as TB. See also BrahPr. 49 a and 51 a (von Negelein, o.c., n. 778) *hiranyam baddhvā darbhenāgrato hareta paścād agnihotreṇānvīyāt . . . caturgrhitam ājyam agrato haret*. AthPr. 5, 1 (a rather corrupt passage) is partly based on MS. 1, 8, 7: *yo brāhmaṇo bahuvīd syāt samuddharet* (read *sa uddharet*) *sarveṇainam tad brāhmaṇa uddhared* (read *brahmaṇoddhared*) *yenāmtarhita(m) hiranyam agrato hared* (corrupt; AB. *rajatam antardhāya* refers to the morning expiation)

vārunam yavamayam carum nirvaped (cf. TB. 1, 4, 4, 3) *ita eva prathamam iti* (cf. MS. 1, 8, 8: 127. 10 f. in the expiation for the extinction of the āhavanīya; for this confusion of the two expiations see above). AthPr. consists of several layers and the same expiation occurs AthPr. 1, 2 in a different form (borrowed from ŚB.): *. . ādītyo 'bhyastam iyāt . . darbheṇa hiranyam baddhvā paścād dhārayed ārṣeyas tat paśyann agnim āhavanīyam abhyuddharet . . ādītyo 'bhyudiyāt . . darbheṇa rajatam baddhvā purastād dhārayed ārṣeyas tat paśyann . .* Probably AthPr. has not correctly understood the expiation of ŚB. and has mixed it up with *prāyaścitti* of AB. and TB. That the gold as well as the silver should be seen by the brahmin is quite out of place. Moreover this does not agree with the interpretation of ŚB., where *purastād* (like *parastād*) denotes a movement (and does not mean "for the eyes of, in front of"). In *purastād/parastād dhartavai* (JB. *dharet*) the root *hr-* (and not *dhr-*) has to be discerned. Cf. *prāñcam hartavai* (JB. *hareyuh*). AthPr. seems to assume the root *dhr-* in *dhartavai*. In the same passage it has *hiranyam antardhārayed* (referring to the ordinary, timely taking out). Is *purastād*, *antar*, *parastād dhārayed* a late systematization? Or should one compare AB. *rajatam antardhāya*? Even KŚS. seems to misinterpret its own *brāhmaṇa* and assume the root *dhr-*: *. . kuśabaddhe hiranye paścād dhriyamāṇa idhmenoddhared ārṣeyo brāhmaṇaḥ* (25, 3, 17) *. . rajata dhāraṇam purastāt* (25, 3, 20). According to the commentaries on KŚS. (see also the translation of the KŚS. passage *Śrautakośa* I, p. 146 and 148) the metals should be held to the rear of the gārhapatya and in front of the āhavanīya; the symbolism of which is, in my opinion, difficult to explain. ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 7 *purastād dhartavai brūyāt . . athedham ādīpyānvāñcam hartavai brūyāt* clearly shows that the silver and the firebrand both are taken in the same direction, i.e. eastward, to the āhavanīya. The re- and misinterpretation of KŚS. is an indication that the oral and written tradition of the texts sometimes is more decisive than the tradition of the ritual practice itself. AgnPr. 12 b (von Negelein, o.c., n. 296) makes the confusion complete by combining *agrataḥ* (which continues TB. *purastād*) with *purastād* and *paścād* (as in ŚB., but reinterpreted) in an expiation which deals with the extinction of the āhavanīya (an expiation which is often confused with the present one, as was shown above): (*sāyam*) *hiranyam agrato hṛtvāhavanīyasya paścād (hiranyam) nidhāya prātaḥ rajatam agrato hṛtvāhavanīyasya purastān nidhāyeti viśeṣaḥ*.

62. — the sun should set, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Surely from him the All-gods¹ turn on whose āhavanīya the sun, when it has not yet been taken out, sets. Having tied up a piece of gold² with a bunch of grass he should take it to the west. Thereby a symbol is made of the one that shines there. That is a symbol of the day. Thus a symbol of the day is made.³ Then they should kindle a firewood and take it to the east. Having laid it on (the āhavanīya) and having taken four ladles of clarified butter he

should offer it with "To the All-gods, *svāhā*". As it may happen in daily life⁴ that one lures back⁵ a guest who runs away by means of a full-grown cow or another favourite thing, in the same way he thereby lures back the All-gods. They all become free from anger towards him.

Now they further say: "If over his āhavanīya, when it has not been taken out, —

63. — the sun should rise, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" Surely from him the All-gods turn over whose āhavanīya the sun, when it has not yet been taken out, rises. Having tied up a piece of silver with a bunch of grass he should take it to the east. Thereby a symbol of the moon is made. That is a symbol of the night. Thus a symbol of the night is made. Then they should kindle a firewood and take it in the same direction⁶ (as that piece of silver). Having laid it on (the āhavanīya) and having taken four ladles of clarified butter he should offer it with "To the All-gods, *svāhā*". [Where there is a fire, there he should take out, knowing: "This (fire) here is found in the gārhapatya"]⁷ The implication⁸ of this (offering) is the same (as in the preceding expiation). But some say: "These offer seeing heaven who (offer) seeing the sun". He now, indeed, should offer after sunrise who may have obtained all bliss or who may desire to leave this world soon.

Now they further say: —

NOTES

¹ The Viśve Devas are the rays of the sun according to the ŚB. version.

² *suvarṇam hiranyam* (ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 6 *haritam hiranyam*) denotes gold in opposition to *rajalatam hiranyam* "silver" in the next chapter.

³ Compare these phrases with the ŚB. parallel and the similar phrases of the next chapter:

JB.	<i>tad etasya rūpam kriyate ya eṣa tapaty ahno vā etad</i>	
ŚB.	<i>tad etasya rūpam kriyate ya eṣa tapaty ahar vā etad</i>	
JB.	<i>rūpam tad ahno rūpam kriyate.</i>	
ŚB.	<i>ahno rūpam kriyate.</i>	
JB.	<i>tac candramaso rūpam kriyate</i>	<i>rātriv vā etad</i>
ŚB.	<i>tac candramaso rūpam kriyate</i>	<i>rātriv vai candra-</i>
JB.	<i>rūpam tad rātre rūpam kriyate.</i>	
ŚB.	<i>mās tad rātre rūpam kriyate.</i>	

Eggeling correctly translates ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 6 *ahar vā etad ahno rūpam kriyate* "and that (sun) being the day, it is made of the form of the day". As appears from the systematical arrangement of the parallels the ŚB. version of that sentence is corrupt. Before *ahno* one should insert *tad*. After that correction

the text seems to be preferable to the JB. version. JB., perhaps borrowing from the corrupt ŚB. text, may have failed to understand *etad* (representing *ya eṣa tapaty*) and have inserted *rūpam*, after which the nom. *ahar* had to be changed into a gen. *ahno*.

⁴ Read with Oertel *yathā vā adaḥ* (instead of *adavadaḥ*), the usual phrase with *adas* in comparisons. See Section 58-59, n. 7.

⁵ JB. has replaced *upa mantrayate* (ŚB.) by *anu mantrayate*, which is equally correct in this context. The meaning "to call back, to beseech some one to come back, to lure someone back with a bait" is strikingly missing in the dictionaries s.v. *anumantrayate*. See ŚB. 1, 5, 2, 6 (*taṁ devā anvāmantrayantā naḥ śrūṇa na āvartasveti*); 1, 6, 1, 5 (the Ṛtus have deserted to the Asuras and the gods say: *ṛtūn evānumantrayāmahā iti keneti* "(...) by means of what bait?"); 4, 4, 1, 16; JB. 3, 96 (*te hocur brāhmaṇam vā anāryam apārāma. teṣāṁ no 'gner haro 'pākramāt. etānam anumantrayāmahā iti. tam anvamantrayanta. sa āgacchad yathā rājñā brāhmaṇo 'numantrayamāna āgacched evam*; see Caland's translation *Auswahl*, p. 241). The difference between *upa-* and *anumantrayate* seems to be that the former means "to win a person (who has not necessarily already gone away) over to one's side", whereas the latter always implies a calling back. When Vāc leaves the gods in anger without deserting to the Asuras, the gods and the Asuras both try to win her (*upa-mantrayate*) ŚB. 3, 5, 1, 21. In the present passage *anumantrayate* of the JB. version may be more suitable than *upamantrayate* (ŚB.) in the context.

⁶ I.e. to the āhavanīya, for the silver is taken *purastād*.

⁷ *yatra vai dīptam tatratad iha gārhapatya ity eva vidvān uddharet* does not suit the context since the *uddharana* does not follow the offering. Moreover this phrase (which is not found in 1, 62 and the ŚB. version) separates the passage ending with *iti juhuyāt* from *asāv eva bandhuḥ*, which refers to *tad yathā vā adaḥ* .., the passage immediately coming after *iti juhuyāt* in the preceding chapter. The mysteriously inserted clause may have a remote parallel in ĀpŚS. 9, 6, 12 *yasyāgnim anāhṛtam sūryo 'bhinimroced yatra dīpyamānam parāpaśyet tata āhṛtya* .. (which refers to the setting of the sun before the dakṣiṇāgni has been procured). In the present passage, however, the gārhapatya is mentioned. Is there any connection with the expiations which deal with the fire which is not produced during churning and for which any other fire may be substituted (cf. ĀpŚS. 9, 3, 3)? The clause has been interpolated for reasons that are not clear.

⁸ For *bandhu* see Gonda, "Bandhu in the Brāhmaṇas", *Adyar Libr. Bull.* 39 (1965), p. 1 ff.

64-65. *The fires are mingled. One takes out fire to an āhavanīya which is still burning*

The brāhmaṇas and sūtras mention several cases of fires coming into contact: all (three) with each other, one of them with one other, all the fires with the fires of another sacrificer, with a village fire, with a forest conflagration, etc. Since the dedications of the oblations to the several forms of Agni (Vivici, Saṃvarga, etc.) are not used for the same expiations in the texts, it is difficult to ascertain what expiation is meant here at the beginning of JB. 1, 64 (*yadāgnayas saṃsrjyeran*). According to Eggeling's interpretation of the ŚB. parallel (12, 4, 4, 2) the fires of the sacrificer come into contact with each other. The expiation is two-fold: a) *sa yadi parastād anyo 'bhidahann eyāt* (JB.); *sa yadi parastād dahann abhīyāt* (ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 2) "If this burning (fire) were to come (to the other) from behind" (Eggeling). b) *yadi tv ayam ito 'bhidahann eyād* (JB.); *yad v ayam ito dahann abhīyāt* (ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 3) "If, however, this burning (fire) were to come from this side" (Eggeling). Eggeling's "from behind" and "from this side" do not make sense if one assumes (as E. seems to do) that the own fires come into contact with each other. What is the fire coming "from this side"? The two (?) fires mentioned in the text are not the āhavanīya and gārhapatya, as appears from JB. 1, 65, where the fusion of these two is discussed. The oblation to Agni Vivici and Saṃvarga occurs in different expiations in the texts and therefore does not from a strictly reliable criterion for the interpretation of this passage. The oblation to Agni Vivici is made in case all the fires come into contact according to AB. 7, 6, 3 and ĀśvŚS. 3, 13, 5. Compare, however, TB. 3, 7, 3, 5 *yasyāhitāgner anyair agnibhir agnayah saṃsrjyante agnaye vivicaye puroḍāśam aṣṭākapālam nirvapet*. The Taitt. sūtras (followed by MŚS.) combine the contact between the own fires and with other fires in an offering to Agni Vivici. The oblation to Agni Saṃvarga is made according to AB. 7, 7, 1 and ĀśvŚS. 3, 13, 7, if the fires come into contact with a village fire. In this case, however, ŚŚS. 3, 4, 5 and AthPr. 2, 7; 5, 4 prescribe an oblation to Agni Vivici, whereas ŚŚS. connects Agni Saṃvarga with the forest conflagration. KŚS., the sūtra belonging to ŚB., prescribes the oblation to Agni Vivici in case the fires come into contact with each other, but an oblation is made to Agni Saṃvarga when a forest conflagration reaches the fires.

In view of this lack of unity among the parallels the ŚB. passage should be interpreted on the basis of its internal evidence. In my opinion it refers to the mingling of the sacrificer's fire (the constantly burning gārhapatya or his three fires taken as one) with another, unspecified fire. Then there are two possibilities: a) The contact is brought about by the other (JB. explicitly speaks of *anya-* fire, which comes to the own fire (for JB. *abhi dahann* compare MS. 1, 8, 9: 129. 16 *yasyā bhy ādāvyena saṃsrjyeta* and especially BhārŚS. 9, 5, 12 *atha yady abhyādāhyena*

saṃsrjyeran vivicaye nirūpya ..). This is interpreted as a support sent by the gods. Compare the expiation for rain coming from outside the ritual sphere on the sacrifice (JB. 1, 56; ŚB. 12, 4, 2, 10). The meaning of *parastād* is not so much "from behind" as "down upon, from outside (from afar, from behind, from before, from above) towards". It specifies the direction of the movement expressed by *abhi* in *abhidahan* (JB.) and *abhīyāt* (ŚB.) and contrasts with *itah* at the end of JB. 1, 64 (= ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 3). b) The own fire occasions the fusion by taking possession of another fire. Therefore one may, if desired, offer an oblation to Agni Saṃvarga, the Grasper. ŚB. even states that one should know *abhi dviṣantam bhrātṛvyam bhaviṣyāmi*, which must refer to coming in contact with (or "grasping") a fire which is not one's own.

For an indication that JB. has borrowed from ŚB. see n. 1. On the other hand JB. has taken one expiation directly from AB. The fusion of the āhavanīya and the gārhapatya is not found in the version of ŚB. and seems to have been borrowed by JB. 1, 65 from AB. 7, 6, 2.

For the expiation which deals with "taking out fire" to an āhavanīya which is still burning (JB. 1, 65) compare ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 4 f.; TS. 2, 2, 4, 6; MS. 1, 8, 8: 128. 7 ff.; AB. 7, 6, 1. The parallels (except MS.) have the same yājyānuvākya. The different position of this prāścitti in the arrangement of ŚB. (between the extinction of the āhavanīya and of the gārhapatya) may be due to the fact that ŚB. regards the āhavanīya when still burning as already "taken out" during the same sacrifice and as erroneously supposed to have become extinct. So this expiation links up with the preceding in ŚB. The fusion of two different fires is the aspect which interests JB. One has to assume a corruption in AthPr. 2, 7 (*yady anugatam abhyuddharet*) and 5, 4 (*ya āhavanīyam anugatam abhyuddharet*) and read *ananugatam*.

64. "If the fires should become mingled, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" If the other fire should come burning all the while up to (his fire) from outside, he should consider: "From outside 'light' has come up to me. My generative power has increased. I shall become more prosperous" (and) it would come to pass so. If, however, he could not put up with that in his heart, he should offer an oblation to Agni Vivici (the maker of a distinction). The same¹ fifteen kindling-verses (are recited); the two butter-portsions relate to the slayer of Vṛtra; the two saṃyājyās are virāj verses; and the introductory and offering verses are these.² "Apart thy brilliant flames go, O brilliant Agni, driven in all directions by the wind. Mightily destroying they overpower the woods, boldly crushing them (like) divine Navagvas" (the puronuvākya)² and the yājyā² "Thee, O Agni, the tribes of men praise as the knower of the sacrificial art, full of discrimination, a distributor of the greatest riches, visible to all, O fortunate one, even when concealed, energet-

ic, a good sacrificer, radiant with ghee". And if one should wish to get rid³ of evil, one should perform this offering. Soon, forsooth, one gets rid of evil.

If, however, this (own) fire should come burning all the while from here to (the other fire), he should offer an oblation to Agni Samvarga (the Grasper). The same fifteen kindling-verses (are recited); the two butter-portions relate to the slayer of Vṛtra; the two saṃyājyās are virāj verses; and the introductory and offering verses are these:⁴ —

65. — "so much being at stake do not cast us off like a bearer his burden. Gathering in your winnings win wealth" (the puronuvākya)⁴ and the yājyā⁴ "From the other side come over to this side.⁵ Favour that (side)⁵ to which I belong". And if one should wish to despoil (*saṃvivṛkṣeta*) one's rival, one should with that object in view perform this offering. Soon, indeed, one despoils him.

Now they further say: "If he should take out fire to a fire (which is still burning), what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" He should offer an oblation to Agni Agnimat. The same fifteen kindling-verses (are recited); the two butter-portions relate to the slayer of Vṛtra; the two saṃyājyās are virāj verses; and the introductory and offering verses are these:⁶ "By Agni is Agni kindled, the wise poet, the youthful lord of the house, the bearer of oblations, in whose mouth the tongue (is a flame and at the same time) a sacrificial ladle"⁷ (the puronuvākya)⁶ and the yājyā⁶ "For thou, O Agni, art kindled by Agni, self being⁸ an inspired seer and a comrade by an inspired seer and a comrade". If one should be desirous of pre-eminence in sacred knowledge, one should perform this offering. One becomes, indeed, brilliant and pre-eminent in sacred knowledge.

Now they further say: "If the āhavaniya and the gārhapatya fires should get mingled, what rite and what expiation would there be in that case?" He should offer an oblation to Agni Viti.⁹ The same fifteen kindling-verses (are recited); the two butter-portions relate to the slayer of Vṛtra; the two saṃyājyās are virāj verses; and the introductory and offering verses are these:¹⁰ "O Agni, come hither for the invitation (of the gods), being chanted (come hither) for the presentation of oblations (to the gods). Sit down on the sacrificial grass (as) a hotṛ" (the puronuvākya)¹⁰ and the yājyā¹⁰ "Whoever seeks to win over Agni with oblations that he may invite the gods, be gracious to him, O pure one" "be gracious to him, O pure one".¹¹

NOTES

¹ Instead of *etā eva pañcadaśa sāmīdhenir* ŚB. 12, 4, 4, 2 reads *tā eva sapta daśa sāmīdhenir anubrūyād* "he should recite those same seventeen kindling-verses" (Eggeling). The use of *eva* in JB. can only be explained as due to borrowing from ŚB., no kindling-verses being mentioned before. ŚB. *eva* ("the same") refers (like 12, 4, 4, 1) to 12, 4, 3, 5 (where the same passage is found without *eva*).

² The *puronuvākya* has been taken from TS. 3, 3, 11, 1 (= RV. 6, 6, 3), the *yājyā* from TS. 3, 3, 11, 2, which reads *tuviṣmaṇasam* instead of *tuviṣvaṇasam* (RV. 5, 8, 3, followed by the version of ŚB.).

³ *vyāvarīte* is construed with the instr. and (in the next clause) with the abl. (cf. JB. 1, 15 f. exhibiting the same alternation). For the conception that separating good and bad (i.e. the own, good fire and the other, bad fire) brings about a deliverance from evil (i.e. from the other fire) see also Section 15-16, n. 1.

⁴ JB. has transposed the *puronuvākya* and the *yājyā*, but even the ŚB. combination seems to be secondary. The *yājyā mā no asmin mahādhanē* (RV. 8, 75, 12; SV. 2, 1000; for our translation see Renou, *E.V.P.* 13, p. 157) should be accompanied by the *anuvākya kuvit su no gaviṣṭaye* (RV. 8, 75, 15; SV. 2, 999). See TS. 2, 6, 11, 3; KS. 7, 17; MS. 4, 11, 6; AB. 7, 7, 1; ĀśvSS. 3, 13, 12; ŚSS. 3, 5, 4; ĀpSS. 19, 25, 12. The ŚB. *anuvākya parasyā adhi saṃvataḥ* (RV. 8, 75, 15) should be followed by the *yājyā vidmā hi te purā vāyam* (RV. 8, 75, 16). See TS. 2, 6, 11, 3 f. with Keith' translation and note. For the *yājyānuvākya* of ŚB./JB. perhaps one may compare KS. 7, 17: 82. 5 ff. where the *pāda parasyā adhi saṃvataḥ* directly follows on *mā no asmin mahādhanē* (which is, however, preceded by *kuvit su no gaviṣṭaye*). SV. reads *agne* for *asmin*.

⁵ JB. agrees with MS. 2, 7, 7: 83. 3 f. in reading *varam* (or *avaram*) and *tam* for *varān* and *tān*.

⁶ The *anuvākya* (RV. 1, 12, 6) and the *yājyā* (RV. 8, 43, 14) occur together i.a. TS. 1, 4, 46, 3; AB. 7, 6, 1 (in the same expiation) and BSS. 13, 7.

⁷ For *juhvāsyā*—see Geldner's note on RV. 1, 12, 6: "Agni's Mund besteht nur aus seinen Zungen = Flammen (...) Doch wäre nach der geläufigeren Bedeutung von *juhū* auch möglich: dessen Mund der Opferlöfl ist" and Renou's translation (*E.V.P.* 12, p. 2) "qui (reçoit en sa) bouche (le contenu de) la cuiller-oblatore". The compound should be taken as a *bahuvrīhi* of the type *asipāni* "whose hand is with a sword" in which *juhū* should mean *à double entente* "tongue" and "flame" or/and "ladle". Compare Keith' translation AB. 1, 16, 28 "with the ladle in his mouth".

⁸ For this interpretation of *saṃ satā* see Renou, *E.V.P.* 13, p. 153.

⁹ In the context of the expiation *vīti* obviously means "the going apart", but in the *yājyānuvākya*s *vīti* does not derive from *vi-i-* (*vyeti*), but from *vī-* (*veti*). The *yājyānuvākya*s are often rather forcedly connected with the accidents to be expiated. For this etymologizing reinterpretation of *vīti* compare TS. 5, 1, 5, 8 and ŚB. 1, 4, 1, 22 f. (see Lüders, *Varuṇa* II, p. 572).

¹⁰ The *puronuvākya* and *yājyā* are RV. 8, 60, 1 and 1, 12, 9.

¹¹ The repetition indicates that the agnihotra section (see the appar. crit. of Raghu Vira's edition) has reached its close.

AGNIHOTRA AND PRĀṆĀGNIHOTRA

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Strictly speaking the term *prāṇāgnihotra* refers only to a definite rite in which food is offered twice a day within the sacrificer himself. In modern secondary literature, however, this term is sometimes applied to all sorts of symbolic and mental rites and mystic, esoteric speculations, some of which neither relate to the *agnihotra* nor to the offering of food to the breaths. Other terms used in this connection are *antaram agnihotram* and *mānasam yajñam*.¹ Coomaraswamy in his paper "Prāṇa-citi"² constantly speaks about the "Internal Agnihotra", but neither the piling of the *prāṇāḥ* in AV. 10, 2, 9; 28, nor the other quoted passages refer to the *agnihotra*.

The origin of this rite and its development from the ordinary *agnihotra* is an important question. Here the speculations of the *brāhmaṇas* and *upaniṣads* play a role. Varenne³ has already done much useful work towards a better understanding of this rite, but even he sometimes completely confuses general speculations on the *prāṇāḥ* with the *prāṇāgnihotra* and overlooks the scattered starting-points in the *brāhmaṇas* which may explain why this *prāṇāhuti* was called an *agnihotra*.

The problem of the social and religious context of this rite is connected with its origin. Varenne's interpretation of the *prāṇāgnihotra* put forward in connection with his view that MNU. forms a "Bréviaire du Renonçant"⁴ is that of a secret ceremony for initiated *saṃnyāsins* and hermits. This is not confirmed by the later *smṛti* literature where the *prāṇāhuti* forms a regular part of the ordinary daily *bhojanam*. Consequently it may be useful to survey here all the starting-points of the *prāṇāgnihotra* and try to discover in the *agnihotra* as it is described and commented upon in the orthodox Vedic texts (such as the *brāhmaṇas*) the first traces of this seemingly anti-ritualistic ceremony.

NOTES

¹ This term (in the wrong neutre form) is frequently used by J. Varenne, *La Mahā Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad II (Étude, Tables, Index et Appendices)*, Paris 1960.

² *J.R.A.S.* 1943, p. 105 ff. For reasons that are not clear to me Coomara-

swamy, p. 106 speaks of an "Internal Agnihotra": "And likewise mentally, in the Internal Agnihotra, as described in ŚB. 10, 5, 3, 1-12, where the Arka-Fires are mentally (*manasā*) piled and kindled . . .". TS. 6, 1, 4, 5, to which C. refers (p. 105), does, indeed, deal with a sacrifice in the breaths ("an idea not rare" as Keith remarks in a note to his translation), but the prāṇāgnihotra does not seem to be meant here.

³ His *La Mahā Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad* II (see n. 1) contains some prāṇāgnihotra passages, the PrāṇU. and an interpretation of MNU. in connection with the prāṇāgnihotra (with which I disagree, as will appear below).

⁴ O.c., p. 43. For a criticism of this interpretation see ch. X (on the performers of this rite).

CHAPTER TWO

GENERAL QUALIFICATIONS OF THE AGNIHOTRA FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A SIMPLIFIED OR SYMBOLIC SUBSTITUTE

The agnihotra is a relatively simple *śrauta* rite to be performed daily by the *āhitāgnis*, but it also functions in a different form in the *gṛhya* ritual. From a historical point of view this *gṛhya* version does not necessarily form a simplification of the *śrauta* rite. The fact is that, besides its *śrauta* version for the probably limited number of *āhitāgnis* a simpler version of this rite exists for the far more numerous performers of the *gṛhya* rites.¹ Even as a *śrauta* rite, however, its relative simplicity may have attracted those people who were not so much interested in ritualistic details as in the religious and philosophical background of the rites. The metaritualists, however, found a favourable field of work in the agnihotra not only because of its ritualistic simplicity. Already in the older Vedic prose texts speculations on the agnihotra were found which offered an excellent starting-point for more developed doctrines. The relationship between the setting and rising sun and the fire, between the fires and the sacrificer's life, and the daily repetition of this rite could not but give rise to theories on macrocosmic (*adhidaivam*) life (i.e. the course of the sun, the course of time), microcosmic (*adhyātmam*) life (the agnihotrin's life) and their ritualistic (*adhiyajñam*) equivalent. Of course these three categories are also found outside the agnihotra and the development is less simple than presented here, but what is essential is the fact that because of its value for man and the cosmos this ritualistically simple rite surpassed several impressive *śrauta* rites in importance. This aspect of the agnihotra may have had a special attraction for the *kṣatriyas* who were excluded from the actual performance of this rite,² but were able to discuss its background on an equal footing with the brahmins and according to some passages even surpassed them in these debates. Their dominant position in some passages which deal with the new upaniṣadic doctrines (often in a vague relation to the agnihotra) should not induce us to accept Garbe's well-known theories on the role of the *kṣatriyas* in the development of the upaniṣads, but on the other hand there is no

reason to support the later tendency to underrate and overlook this phenomenon.³ Varenne⁴ e.g. takes BĀU. 6, 1-2 as a coherent unity in which the upaniṣads of a secret rite (the prāṇāgnihotra) meant for initiated saṃnyāsins are expounded, but he fails to explain the relation between the kṣatriya teacher (in the *pañcāgnividyā*, which can hardly be connected with the prāṇāgnihotra) and the saṃnyāsins. One of the most important factors in this development of kṣatriya influence may have been the fact that discussions on the ritual and on religion in general (the *brahmodyas*) seem to have been delivered in the *sabhā* of the king who was not only the institutor of sacrifices, but also of debates (on these rites). Apparently the kṣatriyas did not always hold themselves aloof, but took an interest in those subjects which were not too technical. Their increasing participation in the debates (and the required preparatory studies), their obvious concentration on the less ritualistic and consequently more progressive subjects and the consequential, incidental victories over some less advanced brahmins in the debates may have created the theme of kṣatriya-overtrumps-brahmin or kṣatriya-teaches-brahmin.

That it was to some extent just a current topic may be illustrated by the *pañcāgnividyā* and similar passages. In ChU. and BĀU. Svetaketu and his father are instructed by king Pravāhaṇa Jaivali who states that this knowledge has not been accessible to brahmins before that time.⁵ The same sort of introduction is found KauṣU. 1, 1, but there the instructing king is Citra Gāṅgyāyani and instead of the *pañcāgnividyā* (with the doctrine of the two paths to heaven) a similar passage is found with the verse *vicakṣanād ṛtavo* . . . The same *pañcāgnividyā* and the passage with the mentioned verse⁶ occur in JB.,⁷ but without the introductory framework of the kṣatriya-teaches-brahmin theme. Moreover looking at the contents of these doctrines which pretend to be entirely new for brahmins one discovers a water doctrine (i.e. the *pañcāgnividyā* as such, without the theory of the two paths) which is found in a different form in several older texts.⁸ The only (but important) innovation is formed by the transmigration theory as it is described in the *pitryāna* passage. JB. likewise seems to know two paths, but no explicit reference to a return to earth is made. Apparently the theme of kṣatriya-teaches-brahmin was appended to already existing passages or doctrines, which were further developed. See also the ŚB. passage in which king Janaka teaches Yājñavalkya the course of the agnihotra oblations which rise to heaven and return to earth in the form of rain,⁹ again

described as a fivefold sacrifice, again a further development of the old water doctrine here explicitly connected with the agnihotra.¹⁰ Note also that king Aśvapati, who in an earlier version (ŚB. 10, 6, 1) teaches some brahmins about *agni vaiśvānara*, puts forward in ChU. 5, 11 ff. his views on the *ātman vaiśvānara* and concludes his teaching with a prāṇāgnihotra description (5, 19 ff.) which occurs in other contexts where it is not ascribed to Aśvapati or another kṣatriya.¹¹ So the kṣatriyas seem to have played a role (in the period of the late brāhmaṇas and the older upaniṣads) in all sorts of speculations especially on the agnihotra and related subjects. This is reflected in the theme of kṣatriya-teaches-brahmin as found in some passages and in the fact that the authorship of several doctrines and even rites (like the *prāṇāgnihotra*) is claimed by kṣatriyas. There seems to be, however, no reason to regard all these passages as reliable sources and to assume that Aśvapati has created the prāṇāgnihotra. At most one may say that the first traces of the prāṇāgnihotra as a micro-macro-cosmic sacrifice coincide with that Vedic period in which kṣatriya influence on the speculations was acknowledged in the texts.

The position of the agnihotra among the other śrauta rites is another important point. The very frequent equations of the agnihotra with other, more impressive rites¹² may be interpreted as a glorification of the simpler rite, but this may also be the result of a different cause. It should be borne in mind that most of the great śrauta sacrifices were expensive, exclusive and to some extent perhaps more textual theory than a frequently performed rite. By making the agnihotra equal to the more elaborate rites and consequently transferring the *phala* of those sacrifices to the compulsory, daily rite, one may have simplified the *yajña* system. In the same way as performing the agnihotra symbolically means sacrificing with all great śrauta rites, the ritual eating of food twice a day means a symbolic agnihotra. I do not want to attach too much importance to this point which primarily illustrates the symbolic function of the agnihotra, but perhaps the prāṇāgnihotra may be said to carry on the "deritualizing" trend of the agnihotra itself.

Concluding these general reflections on the agnihotra I should like to point out that this rite is particularly appropriate for the development into the prāṇāgnihotra because of the factors which were discussed above as well as others which may be added (see van Buitenen's excellent characterization of the agnihotra in connection with MaiU.¹³), but that several aspects of the prāṇāgnihotra do not derive

directly from the old agnihotra. For instance, the micro-macrocosmic conception of the *prāṇāhuti* hardly coincides with the old agnihotra theories. There, indeed, some vague connections between sun, fire and *prāṇa* are found (besides the identification of the fires and the *prāṇāḥ*), but the main stress falls on the rising and setting of the sun (and homologized alternating processes). The *prāṇāgnihotra* has abandoned this relation with sunset and sunrise and is performed much later than the moment of daybreak. The only clear reference to the identification of the agnihotrin (or his *prāṇa*) and the sun as a precursor of the ātman-brahman identification in an agnihotra context occurs at JB. 1, 18, where, however, no starting-points for the *prāṇāgnihotra* seem to be present. Two motifs play a role in that passage. Firstly offering in the āhavaniya means offering oneself (or rather: a second self) in a divine womb (JB. 1, 17), i.e. in heaven, in the sun. After death one is joined with this second self in the sun, or with the sun, which is identical with oneself. Secondly the knowledge of the water doctrine (the verse *vicakṣaṇād*, JB. 1, 18) which teaches that Time, the Year or the Sun as a father generates man by means of the heavenly fluid (rain = seed), means the realization of the identity of father (sun) and son (man).¹⁴ The *prāṇāgnihotra ātmayajña*¹⁵ does not seem to be derived from passages like this. Perhaps one has to distinguish two phases in the development of the *prāṇāgnihotra*: a) the shift from offering in the fires to offering in the *prāṇāḥ*; b) the result, a sacrifice in or to oneself, to the self (the *prāṇa* as the totality of the five *prāṇāḥ* being the ātman and as such identical with the cosmic ātman). The current *prāṇa* doctrines may have played a role. The cosmic *Prāṇa* is already in AV. 11, 4, 12 identified with the highest principles such as the sun and Prajāpati. In other contexts man and his vital powers (*prāṇāḥ*) constitute the microcosmic equivalent of the whole cosmos (*ātman vaiśvānara* in ChU.). The original link between agnihotra and *prāṇāgnihotra*, however, seems to be the identification of the fires with the *prāṇāḥ* of the *āhitāgni*. This *adhyātman* approach becomes especially evident in connection with the agnihotra. We shall first deal with this process of equalizing.

NOTES

¹ The starting-points for the *prāṇāgnihotra* are definitely to be found in the śrauta agnihotra and not in the daily evening and morning *homa* in the one *gṛhya* fire. As an established ceremony, however, its ritualism is not out of

tune with the *gṛhya* rites. That it is only described in late *gṛhya* sūtras (VaiGS.; ĀgnGS.; ĀśvGPariś.; the *Gṛhyasamgraha* mentions a *prāṇāhuti*: 2, 67 *prāṇāhutiṣu someṣu madhuparke tathaiva ca/ āsyahomeṣu sarveṣu nocchiṣṭo bhavati dvijah*) is due to its late origin.

² Sometimes even the performance by a brahmin on their behalf was prohibited. See e.g. MS. 1, 8, 7; KS. 6, 6.

³ See P. Horsch, *Die Vedische Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur* (Bern 1966), p. 427 ff., who himself defends the "Kṣatriya-These . . . wenn auch mit Modifikationen" (p. 432). He seems to overestimate the kṣatriya's influence. Their superiority in discussions is incidental. Note that Yājñavalkya dissuading his fellow brahmins from a discussion with Janaka argues that the defeat of a kṣatriya would not impress the people, whereas being defeated by Janaka would be disastrous (ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 5).

⁴ O.c., p. 70 and 72 f.

⁵ ChU. 5, 3, 7; BĀU. 6, 2, 8.

⁶ See my paper "Der Vers *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo* (JB. 1, 18: 1, 50; KauṣU. 1, 2)", *Z.D.M.G. Suppl.* I (1969), p. 843 f.

⁷ For the five fires see JB. 1, 45.

⁸ See "Der Vers *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo*", o.c., p. 844 and ch. VI B and C.

⁹ ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 1 ff. See ch. VI C. The idea of exchange between heaven and earth, on which this passage seems to be based, is old. See Lüders, *Varuṇa* I, p. 308 ff. ŚB. 5, 3, 5, 17 *agner vai dhūmo jāyate dhūmād abhram abhrād vṛṣtir*; ŚB. 7, 4, 2, 22 *imau vai lokau retaḥsicāu imau hy eva lokau retaḥ siṅcata ito vā ayam ūrdhvaṃ retaḥ siṅcati dhūmaṃ sāmutra vṛṣtir bhavati tām asāv amuto vṛṣṭim tad imā antareṇa prajāyante*.

¹⁰ ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 9 and 10: *sa ya evaṃ vidvān aśnāty agnihotram evāsya hutam bhavati . . sa ya evaṃ vidvān mithunam upaity agnihotram evāsya hutam bhavati*.

¹¹ GB. 1, 3, 13; ŚāṅkhĀ, 10. See ch. IX A.

¹² This subject occurs in almost all the agnihotra sections of the brāhmaṇas. JB. 1, 3 f. even makes the agnihotra a reduced form of Prajāpati's *sahasra-samvatsara* (by way of other abridgements like the *samvatsara*, the *dvādaśāha* etc.) and concludes *sa yad ete sāyamāhuti (prātarāhuti) juhoty etābhyām evāsya hutibhyām sarvair etair yajñakratubhir iṣṭam bhavati*. Cf. BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 15 (end of the *prāṇāgnihotra* passage) *sarvakratuyājīnām ātmayājī viśiṣyate*.

¹³ *The Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad* ('s-Gravenhage 1962), p. 71.

¹⁴ See "Der Vers *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo*", o.c., p. 848.

¹⁵ For the meaning of *ātmayajña* see ch. X.

CHAPTER THREE

THE PRĀṆĀḤ AND THE AGNIHOTRA

The plural *prāṇāḥ* denotes the series of breaths *prāṇa*, *apāna*, *udāna*, *vyāna* and *samāna* as well as the vital powers or functions *prāṇa*, *caḥṣus*, *śrotram*, *vāc* and *manas*, sometimes extended with other vital elements. Why the other functions are also included in the plural *prāṇāḥ* is frequently explained in the passages on the contest of the *prāṇāḥ*.¹ The other vital powers are subordinate to *prāṇa* (sing.: "lifebreath; the totality of the series *prāṇa*, *apāna*, etc.; life; the precursor of the ātman conception"), without which their functioning is impossible. The double meaning of *prāṇa* (1. lifebreath; 2. exhalation) gives rise to problems in those classifications in which both series of *prāṇāḥ* are homologized.² Another confusing factor is that sometimes these vital functions are to be taken as the senses, the powers behind the sense-organs or even as the organs or orifices themselves. In that case *prāṇa* denotes the nostrils or smell, *vāc* the mouth or taste (mostly replaced by *jihvā*), whereas *manas* does not fit the scheme and touch (*tvac*) has to be added. Therefore when speaking of *prāṇa* or *prāṇāḥ* one should be aware of the great diversity of meaning.

The term *prāṇāgnihotra* is interpreted by some translators as "the fire-sacrifice to the breaths", whereas others prefer "the sacrifice in the fires which are the breaths"; mostly one is left with the choice. We shall therefore first consider the function of the *prāṇāḥ* in connection with the ordinary agnihotra.

The fires of the *āhitāgni* are regarded as his *prāṇāḥ* (breaths). This is especially evident at the *agnyādhāna* and in some agnihotra contexts.³ When the fire is churned out the sacrificer breathes on the fire which is being produced and by inhaling places the fire in himself.⁴ In ŚB. the identification of the fire(s) and the sacrificer's breath(s) is also explicitly mentioned outside the direct context of the *agnimanthana*. The fire which is taken from the *gārhapatya* to the *āhavaniya* is the sacrificer's *prāṇa* (2, 1, 4, 22). Just as the gods in their conflict with the Asuras placed the immortal fire in themselves (2, 2, 2, 14), even so the human sacrificer should (symbolically) establish the fire in himself. This is explained in the next paragraph (15),

which deals with the inhalation of the newly produced fire. If one knows that the fires are placed in oneself (*antarātman*), there is no danger of something passing between one's fires or of extinction as long as the *āhitāgni* lives (2, 2, 2, 17). This refers to the agnihotra expiations (passing of chariots, dogs and other unclean animals between the *gārhapatya* and the *āhavaniya*) with which I shall deal below. Here it may be noted that in the special *prāyaścitti* section of ŚB. it is not the *adhyātmam* interpretation which makes the expiation superfluous but the cosmic approach (the fires having been homologized with the three worlds: ŚB. 12, 4, 1, 3). This may be an indication that ŚB. consists of different layers. The nature of these *prāṇāḥ*-fires is described ŚB. 2, 2, 2, 18: *prāṇodānāv evāhavaniyaś ca gārhapatyaś ca vyāno 'nvāhāryapacanaḥ*.⁵ JB. 1, 1, however, describes the several stages of the process of producing fire by friction as the coming into existence of the sacrificer's vital powers (*prāṇāḥ*) and concludes with the statement that having divided these *prāṇāḥ* threefoldly one keeps sacrificing in them. The one by one identifications not being given this sounds rather obscure.⁶ For the equation of the fires with three vital powers see also VādhS. (A.O. 4, p. 6), where in an *anvāhāryāna* on the *agnyādhāna* *prāṇa*, *caḥṣus* and *śrotram* are identified with *titikṣā*, *satyam* and *śraddhā* and with the three fires. So the fires are regarded as the sacrificer's *prāṇāḥ* (mostly breaths, sometimes vital powers). On the other hand one may say that in this symbolism the *prāṇāḥ*-fires are not simply the conveyors of the oblation to the gods but receive this oblation in order to be maintained and strengthened. In a way the (*prāṇa*-)agnihotra is therefore a sacrifice to the breaths.

The fires established at the *agnyādhāna* are used every day by the agnihotrin and it is in the agnihotra that this identification with the *prāṇāḥ* (life) of the *āhitāgni* keeps playing a role, especially (as we have seen above) in the case of the expiations. In the same way as ŚB. 2, 2, 2, 17 the AB. regards the passing between the fires as irrelevant (7, 12, 3: *ātmany asya hitā bhavanti*). According to ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 6 and JB. 1, 61 to take the fire anew from the *āhavaniya* after the extinction of the *gārhapatya* would mean driving the *prāṇāḥ* out of the sacrificer whose body represents the original *vihāra* of the fires. The argumentation that in this case the *āhavaniya* may be taken back to the extinguished *gārhapatya* (the *āhavaniya* being the in-breathing which is taken in towards the *gārhapatya* from which it has been "breathed" out), is quoted and rejected by ŚB. 12, 4, 3, 7

and JB. 1, 61.⁷ One might also extinguish the āhavanīya and churn the gārhapatya anew, but according to AB. 7, 5, 8 this would imply the extinction or departure of the sacrificer's (life)breath, i.e. he would die (*prāṇo yaḥamānam jahyāt*).⁸ So the fires remain connected with the *āhitāgni*'s *prāṇāḥ* and their maintenance (by the daily care and nourishment in the agnihotra ritual) means maintaining the sacrificer's life. See also AB. 7, 12, 5 (agnihotra section): *āhārayet* (sc. the anvāhāryapacana) . . . *prāṇān vā eṣo 'bhyātman dhatte yo 'gnīn ādhatte teṣāṃ eṣo 'nnādatamo bhavati yad anvāhāryapacanas*. Cf. AthPr. 1, 1 (ed. von Negelein, p. 71).

Remarkably this identification with the *prāṇāḥ* hardly occurs in the older passages on the agnihotra (KS.; MS.; TB.) but its occurrence in the ordinary expiation sections of the apparently later texts⁹ proves that it is not exclusively connected with esoteric speculations. There is, however, in ŚB. aside from the ordinary *prāyaścitti* section of the agnihotra an esoteric passage dealing with the extinction of the fires and its expiations. Uddālaka Āruṇi is interrogated on this subject and states that he can atone for the evil effects of the extinction of the several fires (the gārhapati, his eldest son, his cattle, etc. will die)¹⁰ by means of some magic devices or esoteric knowledge (*vidyābhiḥ*) (ŚB. 11, 5, 3, 8 ff.). At first this knowledge only seems to refer to the identification of the fires and the *prāṇāḥ* and their transition into each other. If the āhavanīya or gārhapatya goes out, one should offer in the gārhapatya resp. āhavanīya reciting or reasoning (*iti*): *prāṇa udānam* (resp. *udānaḥ prāṇam*) *apy agād*.¹¹ As is usual in these discussions Uddālaka has said nothing new up to this point. The important part lies in the last questions and answers. The purpose is to ask further and further till there is no more answer or question. If now all the fires would become extinct, one should again produce the gārhapatya and take out the āhavanīya to that side from which the wind is blowing and offer the oblation to Vāyu. One should know *samṛdham me 'gnihotraṃ sarvadevatyaṃ vāyūṃ hy eva sarvāṇi bhūtāny apiyanti vāyoḥ punar visrjyante* (ŚB. 11, 5, 3, 11). Here the *prāṇa* doctrine, of which so many traces are found in the Vedic texts, surfaces within this ritualistic and conservative presentation (that the agnihotra now is *sarvadevatya* hardly matters in this connection). Just as all vital powers depend on the *prāṇa*, so all cosmic entities such as sun, moon and fire depend on the cosmic *prāṇa*, i.e. Vāyu, into which they temporarily enter (at sunset, in case of extinction, etc.) and from which they are again emitted.¹²

Moreover *prāṇa* (the totality of the *prāṇāḥ*-fires) enters into the cosmic *Prāṇa* at death. All this is still not new to the interrogator, who asks as his final question what should be done in case no wind would be blowing. Now it should be noted that, though these brahmodyas have a historical background, the dialogue on this ritualistic and as far as the last question is concerned rather hypothetical problem of an expiation forms more or less a literary device for presenting an esoteric truth.¹³ Uddālaka answers that, after the fire has been produced and taken out anew, he would sit down behind the āhavanīya and drink himself the oblation, knowing: *samṛdham me 'gnihotraṃ sarvadevatyaṃ brāhmaṇaṃ hy eva sarvāṇi bhūtāny apiyanti brāhmaṇāt punar visrjyante*. This looks like a starting-point for the *prāṇāgni*hotra, but the striking differences with that rite are that Uddālaka's agnihotra is only performed on special occasions (if ever; the combination of a windless place of sacrifice with the blowing or going out of the fires is not a current phenomenon) and that it is exclusively claimed for brahmins. The latter point, which makes a rather archaic impression, reminds us of passages like KS. 6, 6 and MS. 1, 8, 7, where the kṣatriya's agnihotra is discussed (food given to brahmins replaces the actual performance).¹⁴ On the other hand one may say that here the cosmic *Prāṇa*, i.e. Vāyu, has been superseded by brahman to which is sacrificed in its microcosmic equivalent, i.e. the brahmin. This seems to foreshadow the brahman-ātman speculations with which the *prāṇāgni*hotra as a sacrifice in the ātman is connected. Moreover this *brahmodya* does not aim at giving rules for emergencies, but reveals an esoteric doctrine and as such may present here the reflection of a *prāṇāgni*hotra practice which had already made its appearance outside the circles of the śrauta ritual. Compare the replacement of milk by *satyaṃ* (to be offered in *śradhā*) in very theoretical circumstances¹⁵ which will be shown to be based on a *satyavāda* doctrine of people who do not seem to set up their sacred fires. These practices or theories were introduced in agnihotra passages as exceptional, hypothetical substitutes of the rite, leaving the actual performance of the agnihotra unimpaired, but showing that fundamentally offering the oblation in oneself or offering *satya* in *śradhā* (i.e. practising truth and meditating on truth) is equal to the ordinary performance of the rite. Under the guise of expiations and by means of the literary device of the debate which always starts with the well-known and the established (i.e. the śrauta rite) and tries to discover its ultimate, secret background

(i.e. the esoteric rite or doctrine), these passages present the esoteric variants of the agnihotra.

It is interesting to note that in the GB. version (I, 3, 13 f.) the discussion has been secondarily extended with a description of this sacrificing in oneself and its implications. That passage forms a close parallel of the prāṇāgnihotra sections ŚāṅkhĀ. 10 and ChU. 5, 19 ff. Like many other passages in GB. the interrogation of Uddālaka has obviously been borrowed from ŚB.¹⁶ Instead of the equation of *prāṇa*, *apāna* and *udāna* with the three fires (*prāṇa udānam apyagād* etc.) GB. has the formulas *prāṇāpānābhyām svāhā*, *samānavyānābhyām svāhā*, *udānarūpābhyām svāhā*.¹⁷ This is a poor effort to combine the three fires and the five *prāṇāḥ* which are not identified one by one. The appended prāṇāgnihotra passage (GB. I, 3, 14) has been included by Miss Gaastra¹⁸ in the list of passages without parallels. A detailed comparison with the mentioned parallels will be made later. Here it may suffice to quote the conclusion in order to elucidate its position (as a secondary addition) within the context itself: *yo ha vā evaṃ vidvān aśnāti ca pibati ca tasyāyam eva dakṣiṇaḥ pāṇir juhūḥ savya upabhart kantho dhruvānnaṃ haviḥ prāṇā jyotiṃsi sadeṣṭam sadā hutam sadāśitam pāyitam agnihotram bhavati ya evaṃ veda yaś caivaṃ vidvān agnihotram juhoti*. This passage which started as an additional teaching by Uddālaka on the last expiation has obviously no connection at all with the preceding *brahmodya*. Every reference to expiations is missing, as also appears from the use of the word *sadā*. The agnihotra oblation consists of milk and in the ŚB. version Uddālaka consequently says "I would drink it myself", whereas in this GB. appendix food is the oblation and the hands are the ladles. It is difficult to surmise whether this prāṇāgnihotra description was later inserted in GB. (i.e. after the inclusion of the ŚB. passage by the compiler of this patchwork brāhmaṇa) or combined from the outset with the ŚB. passage by the author of GB. Anyhow the prāṇāgnihotra seems to be implicitly present in the original version of the Uddālaka interrogation and the addition, though rather clumsy, is not wholly without foundation; it shows that, already in Vedic times, the Uddālaka *brahmodya* was taken as primarily referring to the prāṇāgnihotra. Varenne, who too exclusively connects this rite with "renonçants" and the post-brāhmaṇa period, seems to have overlooked these passages.

It is not only in the expiations of the agnihotra that the identity becomes manifest of the fires and the *prāṇāḥ* of the *āhitāgni* (which

is so clearly expressed in the *agnyādhāna* context¹⁹). During his whole life the sacrificer, who is born at the *agnyādhāna*,²⁰ remains connected with his second self, the fires. Life is the continuous performance of the agnihotra; death is the last agnihotra. The cremation²¹ has the corpse for its oblation and produces a new life in heaven. There is a parallel between the *agnyādhāna*, where the sacrificer in point of fact is the generating father, but at the same time is produced himself, and the cremation, where his fires generate him anew, but are also identical with himself. This unsolvable problem of the father-son and son-father relation manifests itself in the mantras used in both rituals.²² Explicit references to death and cremation are also found in *agnyādhāna* passages. ŚB. 2, 2, 4, 8 (agnihotra section, but relating to the *agnyādhāna*) states that the agnihotrin is born from the cremation fire as from father and mother. According to ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 1 ff. Agni produces at the cremation and maintains in yonder world the agnihotrin, as he has produced (*agnyādhāna*) and maintained (*agnihotra*) the fire in this world. So the lifelong performance of the agnihotra is not only connected with sunrise and sunset, but also aims at the daily care of the ritual self of the sacrificer. The sacrifice in the fires implies a sacrifice in or to the breaths. The *prāṇāḥ*-fires are so to say more object than instrument and the ordinary agnihotra in this respect may be said to be an indirect prāṇāgnihotra.²³

The connection between agnihotra and life (from *adhāna* till cremation) is very clearly made by JB. I, 1-2. Both chapters are introduced by the question *kena juhoti kasmīn hūyate*. The answer runs *prāṇenaiva juhoti prāṇe hūyate* which in short means that the agnihotra is life. The first chapter explains why one offers in *prāṇa*. The churning of the fire at the *agnyādhāna* means the producing of the sacrificer's *prāṇāḥ* (vital powers), in which he keeps offering. In the second chapter the offering of *prāṇa* is explained as the nourishing of these *prāṇāḥ*, i.e. as the continuous giving of life (*prāṇa*) to them.²⁴ The chapter concludes with the cremation. It is, indeed, a small transition from this interpretation of the agnihotra as the sacrificer's life in which the offering of the oblations symbolizes the feeding of the *prāṇāḥ* to the prāṇāgnihotra in which the sacrificer's *prāṇāḥ* are actually fed. The most important difference is the ultimate conclusion of the rite. In the prāṇāgnihotra there is no room for speculations on the cremation and the producing of a new existence in yonder world.²⁵ The relationship between the fire

(of the hearth) and the householder is an old, probably already Indo-European²⁶ conception. The Indian identification of fires and *prāṇāḥ* and the interpretation of the agnihotra as a sacrifice in or to the *prāṇāḥ* or *prāṇa*²⁷ do not seem to be very old. I do not think, however, that agnihotra passages such as JB. 1, 1-2 should be regarded as influenced by an existing prāṇāgnihotra rite. More probably the JB. interpretation of the agnihotra belongs to those brāhmaṇa speculations which form the starting-points for the prāṇāgnihotra. To some extent these speculations form a part of the current *adhyātmam* interpretations as found in the brāhmaṇas.²⁸ See e.g. ŚāṅkhB. 17, 7 (Sarma's ed. 17, 5, 9 ff.) *puruṣo vai yajñāḥ. tasya śira eva havir-dhāne mukham āhavanīya udaram sado 'nnam ukthāni* . . etc. (the vital powers are the priests, the ātman is the yajamāna). Cf. also ŚB. 12, 9, 1, 11 *sa vā eṣa ātmaiva yat sautrāmaṇi* . . *tasyātmeva vedīḥ* (here ātman = body) . . *mukham agnir annam āhutir*. These *adhyātmam* approaches to the actually performed sacrifices ultimately have led to *ātmayajñas* in which the sacrifice is replaced by a mental performance or even by a particular way of life. Sometimes *ātmayajñas*²⁹ with similar identifications as quoted above are connected with the prāṇāgnihotra. These connections are, however, mostly rather forced. It should be borne in mind that the identification of the fires and the *prāṇāḥ* is a permanent one based on a doctrine and that it occurs in various contexts especially in reference to the agnihotra. The other *adhyātmam* interpretations are, however, either made ad hoc or refer to sacrifice in general.

NOTES

¹ For the contest of the *prāṇāḥ* see AĀ. 2, 1, 4 and Keith' note on his translation (p. 205, n. 4). BĀU. 1, 5, 21 explicitly states that on account of the prāṇa's superiority the vital functions are called *prāṇāḥ*. On these *prāṇāḥ* see also D. Schrapel, *Untersuchung der Partikel iva* (thesis Marburg 1970), p. 60 f., who unconvincingly tries to show that they are primarily "Erkenntnisfunktionen". It should be noted that sometimes *retas* (obviously a "Vitalfunktion") is added.

² ChU. 5, 19 ff. equates the breaths and the vital powers, but omits in the latter series *prāṇa*. AiU. 1, 3 combines the vital functions with *prāṇa* and *apāna*. Here, however, the *prāṇāḥ* are senses rather than vital powers. The *prāṇa* represents smell (see Keith, AĀ. ed. and tr., p. 227, n. 7) and the central function of the breath is now occupied by *apāna* (not inhalation, but breath in general, nourished by food). See also U. Schneider, "Die Komposition der Aitareya-Upaniṣad", *I.I.J.* 7, p. 58 ff.

³ Originally the agnihotra was perhaps more a daily maintenance of the fire in the hearth (related with the family's life) than a rite connected with

sunrise and sunset. See Keith, *Rel. and Phil.*, p. 319 and Oldenberg, *Religion*, p. 439.

⁴ The mantra used runs *prāṇe tvāmṛtam ādadhāmy annādam annādyāya* (TB. 1, 2, 1, 20; BSS. 2, 16: 60. 12 f.) or *amṛtam prāṇa ādadhe* (KSS. 4, 8, 27).

⁵ Here *udāna* stands for *apāna* and means breathing in. See also n. 19.

⁶ The *prāṇāḥ* are fivefold, but the fires playing a role in the agnihotra are usually three. In prāṇāgnihotra contexts the five breaths are sometimes equated with the five fires (which receive five prāṇāhutis). This is against the practice of the actual agnihotra (where one offers twice in the āhavanīya). GB. 1, 3, 13 (based on ŚB. 11, 5, 3, 8 ff., where *prāṇa*, *udāna* and *vyāna* are identified with the three fires) not quite successfully tries to combine the five *prāṇāḥ* with the three fires. See note 17 below.

⁷ JB. explicitly stating that the āhavanīya is the inhalation (*apāna*, which is taken back: *apa!*) we have to assume that in the ŚB. identification *prāṇo-dānāv imau* (sc. these two fires) the inhalation likewise refers to the āhavanīya. This homology does not agree with ŚB. 2, 2, 2, 18 (*prāṇodānāv evāhavanīyaś ca gārhapatyāś ca*), where apparently *udāna* is the gārhapatyā. Again an indication that the *agnyādhāna* and *prāyaścitti* sections of ŚB. belong to different layers of the text.

⁸ Here *prāṇa* seems to denote the breath as a totality (life) and not the exhalation (as being identical with the āhavanīya). The extinction of both gārhapatyā and āhavanīya means the extinction of life. The dakṣiṇāgni not being taken out of the gārhapatyā does not play a role here.

⁹ ŚB. and JB. The agnihotra sections of AB. do not belong to the oldest parts of the text according to Keith, *Rigveda Brahmanas*, p. 33.

¹⁰ Apparently this is based on a different set of identifications with the fires.

¹¹ In case the dakṣiṇāgni extinguishes one should offer in the gārhapatyā with *vyāna udānam apy agād*. So the gārhapatyā, āhavanīya and dakṣiṇāgni are *udāna*, *prāṇa* and *vyāna*. This agrees with ŚB. 2, 2, 2, 18 and not with the *prāyaścitti* (see n. 7). Compare ŚB. 7, 1, 2, 21 (*agnicayana* section), where *prāṇa* is āhavanīya and *udāna* is gārhapatyā.

¹² See Ruben, *Beginn der Philosophie in Indien* (Berlin 1956), p. 95 ff. and p. 128 ff., where all relevant passages of the "Atem-Wind-Magier" have been collected. See also IX, n. 23.

¹³ Compare the discussion on the substitutes of the agnihotra oblation ŚB. 11, 3, 1, 2 ff.; JB. 1, 19. See ch. V B. ĀpSS. 9, 10, 2-6 (as well as HirSS. and VaiSS.) mentions this expiation, but one may doubt if Āpastamba here refers to actual practices. He often quotes impressive old sources which lie beyond the transmitted ritual of the Taittirīyas. On the other hand it is remarkable that KauśS. likewise deals with (the GB. version of) this expiation. See n. 17.

¹⁴ Cf. TB. 2, 1, 4, 5: four times the milk is ladled out, but it is offered only twice in the āhavanīya. The two remaining ladles are offered in Agni Vaiśvānara, i.e. in the brahmin officiant who eats the rest of the oblation. Cf. also VāDhS. 30, 2 f. *brāhmaṇo bhavaty agniḥ. agnir vai brāhmaṇa iti śruteḥ*. The text continues with a quotation from the Kāthakas (not found in KS.) to the effect that the brahmin's body is the vedi, his mouth the āhavanīya, his *prāṇa*, *apāna* and *vyāna* the priests, the senses (*indriyāni*) the sacrificial vessels, etc. Several of these equations are found in the *ātmayajñas* of prāṇāgnihotra passages (PrāṇU. 40 *śarīram vedīḥ*; 45 *buddhindriyāni yajñapātrāni*; VaiSmS. 2, 18 *jihvādindriyāni yajñapātrāni*) and in the *ātmayajña* of MNU. 543 ff. (*mukham āhavanīyaḥ*). Remarkably this *ātmayajña* as

described in VādhS. (a sacrifice which is identical with a person or body rather than a sacrifice to the self; cf. PrāṇU. 33 and 38 referring to a *śavira-yajña*) is not performed in one's own body, but in a brahmin's body (*athāpy uddāharanti: pāti tvāti ca dātāram ātmānam caiva kilbiṣāt/vedendhanasamr-dhṣeṣu hutam vipramukhāgniṣu/... varīṣṭham agnihotrāt tu brāhmaṇasya mukhe hutam*; VādhS. 30, 6-7). Apparently every *bhojana* (not only the prāṇāgnihotra as the taking of one's own meal) became connected with the *ātmayajña*. In Manu's parallel of the last sentence (7, 84) the context refers to the honouring of *samāvartins* by the king (7, 82 *āvṛttānām gurukulād viprānām pūjako bhavet*). Compare VaiSmS. 2, 18, a prāṇāgnihotra passage with an introductory *ātmayajñasamkalpa* in the context of the *samāvartana*. Feeding others (which practically only means brahmins) also figures in the prāṇāgnihotra-like passages GB. 1, 3, 14 (*āśitam, pāyitam*) and ŚāṅkhĀ. 10 (*āśayati, pāyayati*). Eating the rest of the agnihotra oblation (by the sacrificer who himself performs the rite) is also taken as a sacrifice ŚB. 11, 1, 7, 3 (*sa yad evaitām ātmann āhutiṃ juhōti*...). According to BSS. 29, 5 the agnihotrin who has become too old to perform the rite should take the fires into himself and eat as much milk as forms an agnihotra oblation (while reciting the agnihotra formulas) whereafter he may eat the rest silently.

¹⁵ ŚB. 11, 3, 1, 4; JB. 1, 19.

¹⁶ This can be proved. In the expiation for the extinction of all the fires GB. does not introduce Vāyu, but prescribes an offering to all the breaths. As the last expiation, however, *atha cen nāgniṃ janayitum śakṇuyur na kutaś cana vāto vāyāt* (cf. ŚB. *nivāte*) is mentioned, which, as far as the absence of wind is concerned, does not make much sense in the context of GB. and seems to point to careless borrowing.

¹⁷ The same formulas occur KauśS. 72, 42, where the sacrificer in the expiation for the extinction of all the fires offers the oblation in himself with these formulas. Cf. n. 13.

¹⁸ *Das Gopātha Brāhmaṇa* (Leiden 1919), p. 18.

¹⁹ See the *agnyādhāna* passages at the beginning of this chapter and BDhS. 2, 10, 18, 8 (ch. X, n. 27). See also BSS. 20, 19 *atro ha smāha baudhāyanah kāmam naṣṭeṣuvā pahṛteṣu vāgniṣu nādrīyetāgnyādhēyam. ādhānaprabhṛti yajamāna evāgnayo bhavanti. tasya prāno gārhapatyō 'pāno 'nvāhāryapacano vyāna āhavanīyah. kāmam upāvarohya juhuyād iti*. See further BhārPiS. 2, 9, 7 f. (*yady āhitāgnir utsṛṣṭāgnir vicchinnāgnir vidhurāgnir vā pramīyeta na tam anyena tretāgnibhyo dahanṭīti. vijñāyate cādhānaprabhṛti yajamāna evāgnayo bhavanti*) and HirPiS. 8, 9 (*ādhānaprabhṛti yajamāna evāgnayo bhavanīti athāpi brāhmaṇam*). In case of serious illness the sacrificer's fires are kindled anew outside the village in order to kindle the waning life-breaths which are identical with the fires (HiPiS. 1, 1: *prānā vā eta āhitāgnir yad agnayas ta enam samiddhāḥ pārayanty agado ha bhavātīti vijñāyate*). BhārParS. 187 identifies the fires and the *prānāḥ* (*tasya prāno gārhapatyō 'pāno 'nvāhāryapacano vyāna āhavanīya udānasamānau sabhyāvasathyāv ity eta evāgnaya iti*). The context deals with the renewing of the fire by the *āhitāgnī* who marries again and observes in that connection that the sacrificer is the fire and his wife the oblation. So the identification of fires and *prānāḥ* here seems to imply that the remarrying sacrificer does not set up completely new fires, but re-establishes the old fires of his first marriage. The fire remains the same, the oblation (= wife) is different. This seems to be the explanation of the difference between *punarādhēyam* and *punar agnyādhēyam* (BhārParS. 185; not clear according to Kashikar's translation). For other identifications with the *prānāḥ* cf. VaiSmS. 2, 18 (*prāṇa = gārḥ.; apāna = āhav.; vyāna =*

anvāh.); ŚāṅkhĀ. 10, 8 and PrU. 4, 3 (*prāṇa = āhav.; apāna = gārḥ.; vyāna = anvāh.*).

²⁰ MS. 1, 6, 4: 93. 6 f. *ajāto vai tāvat puruṣo yāvād agniṃ nādhātte sa tarhy eva jāyate yarhy agniṃ ādhātte*.

²¹ In an *anvāhīyāna* on the *agnyādhāna* VādhS. 3, 11 (*A.O.* 4, p. 12) mentions the *savivādhātvaṃ* ("das Gleichgewicht" according to Caland's translation) of the evening and morning agnihotra which is formed by the cremation. On the lifelong maintaining of the fire see VādhS. 3, 4 (*A.O.* 4, p. 8) *tam eva ihādhāya mṛtyuvantaṃ kurvīta yāvād iha puruṣasyāyus tāvad enam bibhṛyād, yāvād dhaivāmuṣmin loke 'gnir āyus, tāvad dhainam amuṣmin loke ('gnir bibharti)*. Caland's remark "dass mṛtyuvat: 'mit dem Tode versehen' zu bedeuten scheint: 'über das irdische Leben hinausgehend'" is hardly acceptable. I take this word as a compound: *mṛtyu + anta* with *v* in sandhi. For the whole VādhS. passage compare ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 1 ff. (to which is referred below).

²² See the Introduction to Section 46 (end) – 49 (first half) on the mantras *ayam vai tvad asmād asi tvam etad ayam te yonir asya yonis tvam pitā putrāya lokakṛj jātavedo*... (JB. 1, 47).

²³ This feeding or strengthening of the sacrificer's *prānāḥ* is at least one aspect of the prāṇāgnihotra. See Varenne, o.c. II, p. 55: "Or, tous nos textes sont d'accord sur ce point, le fruit que l'on retirera du sacrifice ainsi célébré, ce sera l'invigoration des souffles à qui l'on dédie l'oblation". Other aspects (perhaps later introduced) also play a role in this rite.

²⁴ This is based on the identification of food and life. See the treatment of this passage in the next chapter.

²⁵ On the other hand the prāṇāgnihotra is connected with several speculations that are not found in these agnihotra contexts (e.g. micro-macrocosmic theories; the identification of *prāṇa/ātman* with sun/brahman; etc.).

²⁶ See H. Hartmann, *Der Totenkult in Irland* (Heidelberg 1952), p. 46 ff. For the transference and re-establishment of the fires (which apparently are identical with the sacrificer's *prānāḥ*) see also JB. 1, 46.

²⁷ The plural denotes the five fires, the singular the totality of these fires or rather the *ātman*. A reference to offering in the *prāṇa* may also be present AB. 5, 31, 3. One should offer the agnihotra after sunrise (*udite*), since the sun is the *prāṇa* (it leads forward, *pranayati*, the living beings) and consequently offering *udite* means offering in the *prāṇa*. On the connection between agnihotra and the *prānāḥ* see also TB. 2, 1, 6, 1 ff. For a different conception of internal fires which are identical with the sacrificial fires see ŚB. 2, 3, 3, 1 ff. Is there any special relation between agnihotra and breath in AB. 2, 34, 6 *pranir yajñānām iti śamsati vāyur vai pranir yajñānām yadā hi prāṇīty atha yajño 'thāgnihoṭram?*

²⁸ See also Vasudeva S. Agrawala, "The Vedas and the Adhyātma Tradition", *Indian Culture* 5 (1938/39), p. 285 ff. The *prāṇa* plays an important role in this *adhyātmam* approach, as is observed by the same author, o.c., p. 387 ff. ("One hundred and one names of *Prāṇa* in Vedic literature").

²⁹ For a treatment of the *ātmayajña* I refer to ch. X.

CHAPTER FOUR

THE AGNIHOTRA OBLATION

The usual material of the oblation consists of milk, but several other kinds of oblations are mentioned in the sūtras, mostly in connection with special aims. The milk may be replaced by all sorts of substitutes up to *śraddhā* according to the esoteric passage ŚB. 11, 3, 1, 2 ff. and JB. 1, 19. That passage, however, is based on a different conception of the agnihotra which we shall discuss later. At present we shall restrict ourselves to the oblation in the fires which are taken as the sacrificer's *prāṇāḥ*. This identification with the *prāṇāḥ* (breaths, or more in general the sacrificer's life) obviously involves the equation of the oblation with food (which maintains life). Food (*annam*) and life (*prāṇa*) often are found together in the brāhmaṇas and upaniṣads and are sometimes even identified. No life is possible without food.¹ A reference to this conception of the oblation in connection with the agnihotra (the daily maintaining of life) may be seen in AB. 7, 12, 5, where the *anvāhāryapacana* (one of the fires which are symbolically regarded as established in the agnihotrin) is called the *annādatama*.² VādhS. even combines the symbolic feeding of the *prāṇāḥ* by way of the sacrificial fires with the direct nourishing of the sacrificer in that it regards the two daily agnihotras as the *abhighāra* and *upastaraṇa* of the true agnihotra which is partaking of food twice a day.³ An interesting passage on the meaning of the oblation is JB. 1, 2, where the statement *prāṇenaiva juhōti prāṇe hūyate* is explained by *tad etad annam prāṇe juhōti sa eṣo 'nakāmamāra imān hi prāṇān abhivardhayamānas teṣu juhvad āste*.⁴ One offers food in the fires which are the *prāṇāḥ*, i.e. in one's *prāṇa* (life), and does not die against one's will for by the daily offering in these *prāṇāḥ* one strengthens them. Similar ideas are found in prāṇāgnihotra passages.⁵ In this respect one may say that the prāṇāgnihotra represents the concrete form given to the *adhyātmam* interpretation of the agnihotra. One rite is replaced by another, more direct rite. The fires are abandoned,⁶ but the ritual remains. There is no reason to take the prāṇāgnihotra as a mental sacrifice no more than the feeding of brahmins in all sorts of grhya ritual is *mānasa*. The oblation is very concrete and so are the ritual

actions. The mental sacrifice (for Varenne's use of the term *māna-saṃ yajñam* see ch. I, n. 1 and ch. X) either means the performance in thought of a particular rite, or generally refers to the identification of abstract conceptions (*ahimsā*, truth, etc.)⁷ and the way of life belonging to them with sacrifice or a particular rite. According to Varenne (o.c. II, p. 53) "le sacrifice mental (*māna-saṃ yajñam*) . . . apparaît d'abord comme une adaptation nécessaire des rites obligatoires (lustrations, *agnihotra*) aux conditions de l'état de *saṃnyāsin*". The prāṇāgnihotra, however, is hardly a mental performance of the actual agnihotra. The formulas to be recited (according to Varenne in thought, which is far from certain) are not the agnihotra formulas. The oblations offered in the internal fires do not completely correspond to the usual twofold offering in the āhavanīya. The food-oblation is not identical with the agnihotra milk (or its substitutes) and, for that matter, is more concrete than mental.

For the really mental performance of the rite (without a concrete oblation) we have to look at the *pravāsa agnihotra*, which as the pendant of the agnihotra actually performed at home is mentally performed abroad during a journey. See ch. V, n. 10. Cf. also GobhSm. 2, 157 *manasā naityakam karma pravasaṃ apy atandritaḥ | upaviśya śuciḥ sarvaṃ yathākālam anudravel*. For the mental sacrifice which replaces ritual in general and not a particular rite see VādhS. 30, 8 (*dhyāyāgniḥ satyopacayanam kṣāntyāhutiḥ . . . iti kṛtvā kratum māna-saṃ yāti kṣayam budhaḥ*). Here a way of life (perhaps connected with hermits or saṃnyāsins) is described in sacrificial terms. This is not the mental performance of a particular sacrifice. Compare the end of PrāṇU., where some of these abstract conceptions occur in a *śarīrayajña* and refer as well to life as a sacrifice and not to the prāṇāgnihotra as the mental substitute of the agnihotra. Originally there was no connection between this *śarīrayajña* and the prāṇāgnihotra.

An intermediate phase between the purely mental agnihotra of the sacrificer abroad and the prāṇāgnihotra *bhojanavidhi* (in which every food may form the oblation) occurs BŚS. 29, 5: 376. 3 ff. (dealing with the agnihotrin who becoming too old transfers his fires into his own body): *prakṣālitapādapāñir apa ācamya prāṇmukha upaviśyāgnihotrāyajuṣā yāvanmātram vratayitvā tūṣṇīm bhūyo vrata-yet prajāpatiṃ manasā dhyāyann ity evam evopāsitāśarīravimokṣaṇāt*. Compare the prāṇāgnihotra *bhojana* BDhS. 2, 7, 12, 2 (*suprakṣālitapāñipādo 'pa ācamya*) . . . *prāṇmukha upaviśya* . . . (the passage be-

tween brackets is found in the quotation *Smṛticandrikā* II, p. 605); 2, 7, 12, 4 *pañcānnena prāṇāhutir hutvā tūṣṇīm bhūyo vratayet prajāpatiṃ manasā dhyāyan*. Apparently the dharmasūtra passage is based on the śrautasūtra where the parallel with the actual agnihotra (especially as far as the oblation is concerned) is more evident.

The oldest agnihotra passages in the brāhmaṇas already mention the distinction between the first and the second āhuti (*yajusā* and *manasā*; dedicated to Agni/Sūrya and Prajāpati; the second larger than the first). Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*, p. 611 observes in connection with the prāṇagnihotra that on the analogy of the second, silent offering of the agnihotra "man nach den fünf Spenden die übrige Mahlzeit *yatawāg aśnāti*, schweigend verzehrt". In BSS., however, the analogy is more complete, as the first single āhuti is not replaced by a fivefold prāṇāhuti. The sūtra does not state anything about the food which is eaten by the enfeebled agnihotrin, but *vratayati* often refers to consuming milk and this would perfectly agree with the oblation of the actual agnihotra. It is hard to say whether *yāvanmātram* in BSS. 29, 5 implies that the same amount of milk is drunk⁸ as offered in the first agnihotra libation or that the term simply indicates a moderate amount of milk. Anyhow, if milk forms the food in the śrauta passage, the first draught (*yāvanmātram vratayitvā*) represents a better substitute of the first agnihotra oblation than the fivefold prāṇāhuti. For *bhūyo vratayet* compare the agnihotra places TB. 2, 1, 4, 1 *uttarām bhūyo juhuyāt*; ŚB. 2, 3, 2, 17 *bhūya ivottarām* (sc. *juhoti*) *bhūya iva sruci pariśinaṣṭi*; MS. 1, 8, 5 *uttarāhutir bhūyo hotavyā*. Bühler's translation "let him finish his meal silently" (BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 4) may be correct in the dharmasūtra context. In the source (BSS.), however, *bhūyo vratayet* after *yāvanmātram vratayitvā* cannot but refer to a second larger oblation or substitute of an oblation (presumably consisting of a larger draught of milk taken by the old ex-agnihotrin). Varenne (o.c. II, p. 56 f.) dealing with *tūṣṇīm*, *manasā* and *prajāpatyam* does not mention the BSS. passage and is even silent on *tūṣṇīm bhūyo vratayet prajāpatiṃ manasā dhyāyan* in the BDhŚ. passage which so strikingly speaks against his assumption of a silent prāṇāhuti. The points of agreement between the two Baudhāyana passages show that at least as far as the description of the ritual is concerned the dharmasūtra passage is based on the śrautasūtra and that in this respect BSS. 29, 5 forms a link between the actual agnihotra and the prāṇagnihotra as we know it from BDhŚ. This does not mean that the combination of the

mental agnihotra (without a concrete oblation) and the offering of the agnihotra oblation in oneself (with agnihotra formulas), which is found in this sacrifice of the enfeebled ex-agnihotrin, forms the sole starting-point of the prāṇagnihotra. The lack of any reference to the *prāṇāh* is remarkable. The prāṇagnihotra apparently still did not exist. There is no reason to regard the ex-agnihotrin as a hermit or samnyāsin. The sūtra describes him as *jīrnasyāśaktasya cāgnihotrasteṣṭāyām*. The agnihotra is always considered to be concluded by death or old age.

Some starting-points have been pointed out. We shall now consider passages with symbolic interpretations of the agnihotra which may be important in connection with the prāṇagnihotra.

NOTES

¹ For food in relation with *prāṇa* (life) see e.g. ŚB. 7, 5, 1, 16 ff.; TU. 3, 3; MaiU. 6, 11. In the well-known *prāṇa* hymn (AV. 11, 4) the cosmic *Prāṇa* produces and maintains life on earth (in the living beings) by sending rain (= food, = life).

² Cf. the *agnyādhāna* mantra *prāṇe tvāmṛtam ādadhāmy annādam annādyāya* (TB. 1, 2, 1, 20). See III, n. 4.

³ VādhS. 3, 34 (A.O. IV, p. 30 f.). Caland observed: "Die schwierige Stelle, deren Text besonders am Schlusse sehr unsicher ist, wage ich nicht zu übersetzen". The passage is, however, on the whole perfectly clear. After the statement that the food which is cooked after the morning and evening agnihotra forms the dakṣiṇā of these two sacrifices (and the rejection of this statement), this food (i.e. the twofold *bhojana*) is described as the true agnihotra. The sacrificial oblations just form the *upastaraṇa* and *abhighāra* (the sprinkling under and over). The second āhuti of the morning agnihotra and the first āhuti of the evening agnihotra represent the *u.* and *a.* of the morning *bhojana* (*yad ahaḥ pacati*); the second āhuti of the evening agnihotra and the first of the morning agnihotra are the *u.* and *a.* of the evening *bhojana* (*yad rātriṃ pacati*). So one may let the officiant or someone else perform all the ritual actions of the agnihotra (*kāmaṃ tu haivaṃviduṣo 'gniṣu kṣīram ā ca siñced* . . etc.), but the agnihotrin himself remains the performer of the agnihotra (*yathā haiva tat svayamhutam agnihotram bhavati tādṛk tat*).

⁴ For the textcritical treatment of this corruptly edited passage see my notes on the translation. Life (*prāṇa*) is offered in the *prāṇa*-fire as the oblation offered in the fire(s) means food for the fire(s) or *prāṇa*(s).

⁵ See III n. 23. Cf. also MaiU. 6, 11 (probably referring to the prāṇagnihotra).

⁶ At least in the original prāṇagnihotra the offering in and to the breaths seems to replace the actual agnihotra and the omission of the agnihotra presumably meant the abandoning of the fires. The prāṇagnihotra as an established rite, as a *bhojanavidhi*, apparently does not exclude the use of *grhya* fires. The *Grhastharatnākara* (p. 322) commenting on BDhŚ. 2, 7, 13, 9 (the omission of the prāṇagnihotra by a householder or student who have undertaken a fast) even describes this *grhastha* as an *āhitāgni* (who sometimes has to fast before his sacrifices): *grhastho 'trāhitāgnir anaśnan tūpavāsam*

kurvan . . , which proves that at least in later times the prāṇāgnihotra did not exclude the sacred fires (and consequently perhaps not even the actual agnihotra).

⁷ ŚB. 2, 2, 2, 19 seems to refer to such kinds of mental sacrifices. The speaking of truth is taken as the kindling of the *āhitāgni*'s fires, which in the preceding paragraph were equated with the *prāṇāh*. Truth forms the oblation. Cf. TB. 1, 1, 4, 2 on the speaking of truth by the *āhitāgni*. In the next paragraph — a difficult passage; see Eggeling, *S.B.E.* XII, p. 452 (*Add. and Corr.*) — Aruṇa Aupaveśi declines the establishing of the fires and stresses the speaking of truth as the right worship. Apparently this refers in a very vague way to a *satyavāda* doctrine of non-sacrificers. The connection with the context, which deals with the actual establishing of the fires and their equation with the *prāṇāh*, is difficult to account for. The only correspondence of the *satyavāda* mental sacrifice with the prāṇa-fire theory in this ŚB. *agnyādhāna* passage seems to be that the fires are internal. Their being the *prāṇāh* has no function in the truth sacrifice.

⁸ *Śrautakośa* I, 1 (*English Section*), p. 185 f. translates: "he should wash his hands and feet, sip water, sit with his face turned towards the east, and, with the formulas relating to the *agnihotra*-oblations, and meditating upon Prajāpati, partake of as much milk as is usually offered at the *agnihotra*-oblation, and, without reciting any formulas, partake of as much more milk as he may require". The rendering of *yāvanmātram* may be correct. The meditation on Prajāpati, however, is wrongly connected with the first "oblation". Note that VārPar. (quoted in translation *Śrautakośa*, p. 186) prohibits the taking of other food than the agnihotra oblation (milk or clarified butter), but on the other hand does not prescribe the usual agnihotra formulas.

CHAPTER FIVE

THE SYMBOLISM OF THE AGNIHOTRA

A. *Adhidaivam*

The cosmic interpretation of the agnihotra is related to sunset and sunrise taken as an offering of the sun in the fire and of the fire in the sun. See JB. 1, 9 *sa yad ādityo 'stam ety agnāv eva tad ātmānam juhōti* (.) *ādityam udyantam agnir anūdēti. āditya eva tad ātmānam juhōti*. This cosmic sacrifice is maintained by the daily performance of the agnihotra. See ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 36. where the view that one offers Sūrya in Agni and Agni in Sūrya at the evening and morning agnihotra, is mentioned (and criticized). ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 2 f. two of the three brahmins who are interrogated on the agnihotra put forward the view that the sun and the fire are both heat, resp. light and that one offers these heats or lights in each other in the two daily performances of the rite.¹ One might compare the discussion between Janaka and five brahmins whose different views on the meaning of sun and fire in connection with the agnihotra all hinge on the fact that sun and fire are offered in each other by the agnihotra (JB. 1, 22 ff.). According to TB. 2, 1, 6, 5 one may omit offering the agnihotra during one or two days if one knows that the sun is offered in the fire. This is based on a Prajāpati myth which relates how Prajāpati for fear of Agni once offered the sun in Agni. On account of this mythical context the offering of the fire in the sun is not mentioned. Apparently the knowledge of the meaning of the agnihotra may replace the actual performance of the rite. The author of the brāhmaṇa could omit the rite at the most two days; this limitation may have not existed for others (whose views either are based on passages like this, or form the source of which the TB. passage represents the reflection). In VādhS. 3, 40 (*A.O.* 4, p. 35) sun and fire are offered in each other in case all material for the oblation should be lacking.²

B. *Adhyātmam*

Speaking the truth is regarded as the offering of an oblation in the internal fires in ŚB. 2, 2, 2, 19. Though not explicitly mentioned this

may refer to the agnihotra. The daily speaking of truth during one's whole life would then be a symbolic sacrifice.

The cow, the calf, the post and the rope by which cow and calf are bound together to the post are equated by JB. 1, 19 with *vāc*, *manas*, *hr̥dayam* and *prāṇa*. At first sight this seems to be a simple incidental *adhyātmam* interpretation of a rite without an established doctrine to support the identifications as in the *prāṇa*-fire theory. The ŚB. version (11, 3, 1, 1 ff.), however, identifies the flame of the fire (*tejas*) with *śraddhā* and the oblation (*ājyam*, remarkably not milk) with *satyam*.³ A discussion between Janaka and Yājñavalkya on the material for the oblation and its substitutes immediately follows in both versions. If ultimately all material (even herbs and water) should be lacking, there would be nothing at all, as Yājñavalkya observes, but even then the agnihotra could be performed by offering *satyam* in *śraddhā*. The connection with the introductory passage is evident in the ŚB. version. Obviously the discussion does not aim at giving rules for emergencies and again the only importance of the debate lies in the conclusion, the point beyond which one cannot proceed, the final truth.⁴ The very hypothetical circumstances (everything is lacking) are comparable with the situation of the expiatory offering of the oblation in oneself.⁵ The real purpose of the passage is again the introduction of an esoteric practice or doctrine. In this instance the doctrine that speaking the truth is equal to sacrificing. The occurrence of this *satyavāda* in other contexts is an indication that the offering of truth is not based on an incidental *adhyātmam* interpretation. The identification, however, of fire and *śraddhā* does not belong to the regular brāhmaṇa speculations on the agnihotra and the fires, and neither can speaking the truth be connected with interpretations of the agnihotra as a continuously returning, twofold process (sunset and sunrise, night and day, milking of the cow and eating twice a day, in- and exhalation) nor with the theory that the agnihotra is (the maintenance of) the sacrificer's life. We must therefore conclude that an extraneous doctrine has been combined with the agnihotra.⁶

The truth doctrine is not a real mental sacrifice (which would require the performance in thought of fixed ritual actions at a fixed time), it is rather a special way of life implying the speaking of truth, the search for truth and the meditation on truth, to be compared with *tapas*. It is the superior, alternative "ritual" of the non-sacrificer. Being prescribed for the whole life (at least only ending with

death) this search for truth as the substitute of the sacrifice could not but be connected with the agnihotra. As such (in view of the general image of the lifelong agnihotra and not of the fixed morning and evening performances) the practice of truth may be regarded as a mental agnihotra. Perhaps we must situate this *satyavāda* in the forests. See BĀU. 6, 2, 15 *ye cāmī arāṇye śraddhām satyam upāsate* . . . Probably, however, a king like Janaka, who by no means should be regarded as the designer of the doctrine of truth, did not get his information from naked ascetics who would not frequent his *sabhā*. The *arāṇya* in opposition to the village or town denotes the secret, esoteric sphere rather than a permanent habitation and therefore has no relation with the *āśrama* system.⁷ One may even live in the village and perform esoteric rites or study secret texts in the *arāṇya*, which in practice only means outside the village, in solitude. Aruṇa Aupaveśi, whom his kinsmen in vain try to persuade to set up his fires (he is already advanced in years) and who seems to be an adherent of the *satyavāda*, apparently does not live outside society (ŚB. 2, 2, 2, 20). So sacrificers and non-sacrificers could meet each other and it was perhaps especially in the *sabhā* of the kṣatriyas (such as e.g. Janaka), the institutors of sacrifices and debates, that priests and theorists kept touch with each other.

The discussion between Janaka and Yājñavalkya has a parallel in VādhS.⁸ The continuation of this passage (in which no references to the *prāṇāḥ* were found) offers a better starting-point for the *prāṇā*-gnihotra (ŚB. 11, 3, 1, 5 ff.; JB. 1, 19 end-1, 20). Presumably two different passages have been put together. The ŚB. version of the second passage (questions and answers in the form of ślokaś with a prose commentary of the author of the brāhmaṇa) starts with *tad apy ete ślokaḥ*, whereas the apparently borrowing JB. has *atha hainam upajagau*⁹ and seems to force the connection between the two passages, which contain rather different conceptions. Here again an esoteric doctrine is introduced in an expiatory context; it is connected with the *pravāsa* (going abroad) of the agnihotrin. How does he remain in contact with his fires, i.e. how is the effect of his leaving neutralized (*katham svid asyānapaprositaṁ bhavati*)? By the mind (*manasā*); i.e. mentally he remains connected with his fires (his second self) in which one continues to offer his agnihotra at home. Abroad he should recite in thought (*manasā*) the formulas at the prescribed time.¹⁰ If, however, one makes a long journey and in course of time begins to neglect one's duties and becomes careless

with relation to the mental ceremonies of the *pravāsa* (*yat . . pra-mādyati*¹¹), where (in what fire) do they offer the oblation which is offered for him at home? The actual performance of the rite at home on behalf of the traveller should have a counterpart in the mental agnihotra abroad. If the traveller neglects this mental agnihotra he still performs (unconsciously) the counterpart of the home agnihotra, because an oblation is offered in the one who is awake in the living beings (*yo jāgāra bhuvaṇeṣu*),¹² i.e. in the *prāṇa*. See also AthPr. 1, 1 *katham agnīm ādhāya pravāsati. yathainān na virodhayed api ha śaśvad brāhmaṇanigamo bhavati. prāṇān vā eṣo 'nucarān kṛtvā carati yo 'gnīm ādhāya pravāsati*. The separation from the fires is undone by taking them along with oneself in the form of the *prāṇāḥ* (which in the same context are identified with the fires: *prāṇā vā ete yajamānasyādhyātman nīdhīyante yad agnayah*). Unlike the *manas*, which sometimes may be deficient in its sense of duty, *prāṇa* always remains present at its post according to ŚB. and JB. Therefore one says that the agnihotra is breath or life (*tasmād āhuḥ prāṇaḥ agnihotram*; ŚB. *prāṇa evāgnihotram*). The JB. version adds *yāvad dhy eva prāṇena prāṇīti tāvad agnihotram juhōti*. Cf. ch. III, n. 27 (referring to AB. 2, 34, 6). The differences with the *prāṇāgnihotra* and the ideology of the ordinary agnihotra (the maintenance of the *prāṇāḥ*-fires) are noticeable. The fire indeed seems to be homologized with breath in ŚB. and JB., but there is no reference to feeding or maintaining the *prāṇa* or *prāṇāḥ*. Here breathing, the continuous process of life, is the agnihotra. Now life is not possible without food and the maintenance of the *prāṇa* may have been implied. On the other hand, the continuous process of in- and exhalation may have been connected with the similar cosmic process of sunrise and sunset. The context does not give any information as to the concept on which this "prāṇāgnihotra" is based. The difference between this *prāṇa*-sacrifice and the *prāṇāgnihotra* is that the latter is a real sacrifice, whereas the "prāṇāgnihotra" of the present passage is only a theory about an unconscious, automatic process; it is not even a mental sacrifice. The incidental character of this "breath-sacrifice" does not exclude the possibility that, as is often the case in these discussions dealing with expiations, an esoteric doctrine is introduced. That doctrine teaching that life (breathing) itself is an agnihotra may imply the abandonment of the daily performed rite.

Again in an expiation and remotely comparable to the passage

above on the substitutes for the milk¹³ is the mental sacrifice briefly referred to in AB. 5, 27, 9 and 10. When milk has been spilt, one should offer the remainder if it is sufficient for an oblation. Otherwise another cow has to be milked, but in any case an offering should be made even if it were only consisting of *śraddhā* (*ā tv eva śraddhāyai hotavyam*). This incidental replacement of the milk offering by a mental substitute is here, however, found in a purely ritualistic and unesoteric context. The *śraddhā* sacrifice does not form the essential part of the passage. Such incidental mental performances of the agnihotra, in which one offers one's good intention, are not like the *satya-śraddhā* sacrifice to be connected with a special doctrine, but are simply based on anxiousness about the omission of one single performance.¹⁴ The mental *śraddhā* replaces the concrete oblatory material which is not available for some reason or other.¹⁵

Varenne (o.c. II, p. 86) quotes Renou's translation of KauṣU. 2, 5, which deals with an *antaram agnihotram* to be taken as the offering of speech in breath (during breathing) and of breath in speech (during speaking), and observes: "Ce court fragment reste isolé dans l'ouvrage, mais il se réfère en réalité à un texte de l'Āraṇyaka dont l'Up. est partie intégrante celui de l'école Śāṅkhāyana" (i.e. ŚāṅkhĀ. 10, the *prāṇāgnihotra* passage). The only relation, however, between the two passages is the occurrence of the term *antaram agnihotram*. Unlike the *prāṇāgnihotra* is the agnihotra of KauṣU. not a rite. The offerings are made during the whole day and night, unconsciously (*ete 'nante 'mṛtāhuti jagrac ca svapamś ca samtatam avyavachinnam juhōti*). This hardly refers to breathing exercises (difficult to be performed during sleep) and Renou's remark¹⁶ "on est bien ici dans une atmosphère de Yoga" can only be based on the opening words of this passage *athātaḥ samyamanam* (or *sāmyamanam*) *prātardanam antaram agnihotram*. I do not see how this theoretical approach of the agnihotra, which is comparable to the JB. passage above (*yāvad dhy eva prāṇīti tāvad agnihotram juhōti*),¹⁷ could be called the restraint of Prātardana. Moreover this conception of the speech-breath sacrifice is hardly to be ascribed to Prātardana, as it is already found ĀA. 3, 2, 6 and ŚāṅkhĀ. 8, 11, where the Kāvaseyas ask why one should study the Veda and sacrifice, breath being sacrificed in speech and speech in breath. This has no relation with the breath *vṛata* of BĀU. 1, 5, 23. One may compare JB. 2, 50 *yadā vai tūṣṇīm āste prāṇam eva vāg apyeti . . . tad yad evamvid vadati havir-yajñair asya tad iṣṭam bhavati. yat prāṇīty agniṣṭomenāsya tad iṣṭam*

bhavati ... and JUB. 3, 1, 1, 14 *na vai svapān vācā vadati. seyam eva prāṇam apyeti*. Sāyaṇa's commentary on the AĀ., which refers to the agnihotra with regard to this sacrifice of the Kāvaseyas, quotes the Kauṣītakis: *kauṣītakiṇaḥ tathā tasya sāyamtanam prātastanam ity ādinā* ... Since this quotation is not found in any Kauṣītaki text as far as I know, one may perhaps change *sāmyamanam* (some editions read *sāyam annam*) *prātardanam* into *sāyamtanam prātastanam*, and assume that Sāyaṇa refers to the present passage or its untransmitted source.¹⁸ Neither in its ritualistic aspect (which in fact is missing) nor in its basic conceptions is this so-called *anta-ram agnihotram* related with the *prāṇāgnihotra*.

C. Combination of the *adhidaivam* and *adhyātmam* agnihotra

ŚāṅkhB. 2, 8 (ed. Sarma 2, 6, 23-2, 7, 15) deals with the permanent offering in each other of fire and sun, night and day, in- and exhalation. He who knows these six sacrifices performs the agnihotra, even if he does not offer in the fire (*sa ya etāni ṣaḍ juhvati veda, ajuhvata evāsyāgnihotram hutam bhavati*). The continuous human and cosmic process of life (breathing and time with their alternations of in- and exhalation, day and night) is homologized with the agnihotra, which of old was to maintain the sun's alternating process of setting and rising.¹⁹ The passage ends with *tad yathā ha vai śraddhādevasya satyavādinas tapasvino hutam bhavati, evaṃ haivāsyā hutam bhavati, ya evaṃ vidvān agnihotram juhoti*. The spaced genitives might be taken as "truth speaking ascetic who has *śraddhā* for his deity". As we have seen above, however, *satyavādin* is not just an adjective meaning "speaking the truth", but refers to a special doctrine, the non-sacrificing adherents of which are not necessarily ascetics. So perhaps the brāhmaṇa refers to three categories of non-sacrificers or performers of mental sacrifices. The ŚāṅkhB. passage, which explicitly states that actually performing the agnihotra means offering it twice (*juhvata evāsyā dvir hutam bhavati*) and that one becomes immortal even if the gods have eaten only once of the two libations (i.e. the daily agnihotra is superfluous), seems to apply the principles of non-sacrificing or the replacement of the ritual by esoteric theories and practices (which are not always mental sacrifices) of the *satyavādins* and others to the agnihotra, which is a suitable medium for the symbolism contained in their theories. The actual performance of the rite is not wholly abolished. The knowl-

edge of its implications, however, practically makes the ritual superfluous and in this respect the approach of the ŚāṅkhB. may be compared to that of the *satyavādins* etc., with whom, however, no agreement of conceptions exists. The latter have a particular way of life, particular doctrines on life and the duties to be carried out, whereas this substitution of the agnihotra as found in the ŚāṅkhB. is only based on the knowledge that life itself in its macro- and microcosmic aspect (i.e. independent from the actions of the individual) is equal to the agnihotra, which is therefore made optional.²⁰ As for the meaning of this passage one may compare section B.²¹ The inclusion of the cosmic aspect shows even more than those *adhyātmam* approaches that this interpretation of the agnihotra does not agree much with the basic conception of the *prāṇāgnihotra* as the identification of the fires with the *prāṇāḥ* is not central here and the aspect of alternation stands in the forefront. In- and exhalation symbolize the two daily agnihotras. In the *prāṇāgnihotra* (and the *adhyātmam* interpretation of the agnihotra which is based on the identification of fires and *prāṇāḥ*) the twofold performance, the evening and morning aspect, the alternation in general do not play an important role. Indeed there is a strict rule in the dharma literature that one should eat (i.e. perform the *prāṇāgnihotra*) only twice a day,²² but there is no difference between the two meals (which moreover are not taken at the time of the agnihotra, i.e. at sunrise and sunset).

NOTES

¹ *ādityo vai gharmaṣaṁ tam sāyam agnau juhomy agnir vai gharmaṣaṁ tam prātar āditye juhomi* ...

² For the parallel from JB. and ŚB., where *satyam* is offered in *śraddhā*, see below (ch. V B).

³ See ch. IV, n. 7.

⁴ The rest belongs to the usual, rather tedious substructure of the literary building which even Plato sometimes could not avoid in his dialogues. Of course the practice of the debates may not have differed too much from this description.

⁵ See ch. III, n. 15.

⁶ See below ch. V C, where ŚāṅkhB. makes a comparison with the sacrifice of the *satyavādin*. ViṣṇuP. 3, 9 mentions among the seven (instead of five) daily *mahāyajñas* the sacrifice of truth (by which one should satisfy the whole world).

⁷ See Oldenberg, *Nachr. K.G.d.W.* (Gött. 1915), p. 382 ff.

⁸ In this parallel (cf. n. 2) sun and fire are offered in each other, a topic too archaic and too well-known to be treated in a Janaka-Yājñavalkya discussion as a carefully guarded secret (*sa vai tarhittham nedīyo nyāsarpeti. sa ha nyāsarpa* ...). Therefore I am inclined to take this version as a Tait-

tirīya adaptation of the ŚB. or JB. passage. TB. 2, 1, 6, 5 already dealt with the sun-agnihotra as the incidental substitute of the ordinary agnihotra. For *satyam* and *śraddhā* in the Vādhūla agnihotra section see VādhS. 3, 36 (A.O. 4, p. 31), where the context seems to be too corrupt to give a hold.

⁹ For the meaning of this difference in formulation see Horsch, *Die Vedische Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur*, p. 223 ff. The *śloka* may indeed be later than the *gāthā* as a rule, but in the relation between ŚB. and JB. the use of the term *śloka* hardly proves the ŚB. passage to be younger (Horsch, p. 112: "wohl jünger").

¹⁰ See Kane, *Hist. of Dharmas. II*, p. 1008: "When the householder is away alone it is his duty to perform all actions at the time of the agnihotra ... which he can perform without his fires and to go mentally through the whole procedure". See also BSS. 24, 30 *pravasan yajamānam kurute* (tr. *Śrautakośa I, Engl. Sect. 1*, p. 99). See further ch. IV.

¹¹ For the interpretation of *pramad-* see Minard, *Trois Énigmes I*, § 366 b. On the always awake and never careless *prāṇāḥ* see also VS. 34, 55.

¹² The breath is always awake (PB. 10, 4, 4). Cf. PrU. 4, 3 *prāṇāgnaya evaitasmin pure jāgrati gārhapatyō ha vā eṣo 'pāno vyāno 'nvāhāryapacano yad gārhapatyāt prāṇīyate prāṇayanād āhavanīyaḥ prāṇaḥ*. Minard, o.c., § 367-368 rightly criticizing Eggeling's untenable interpretation of ŚB. 11, 3, 1, 7 and 8 (*kasmin sāsya hutāhutir grhe yām asya juhvati* and *yo jāgāra bhuvaneṣu . . tasmin sāsya hutāhutir grhe yām asya juhvati*) himself completely misunderstands this passage (due to the wrong connection made between *kasmin* and *grhe*, which makes him ask: "Mais qu'est-ce que cette maison du souffle?" ... See the translation of JB. 1, 20 (with note).

¹³ ŚB. 11, 3, 1, 4; JB. 1, 19.

¹⁴ One should bear in mind that the agnihotra is performed twice a day during one's whole life and that the performance is tied down to a fixed, short moment (sunset, sunrise). Therefore emergencies are not entirely hypothetical.

¹⁵ The offering of *śraddhā* means the mental offering of an oblation which actually (i.e. in a concrete form) is not present. Cf. the *pañcāgnividyā* (ChU. and BĀU. version), where the gods offer *śraddhā* (a mental oblation), out of which water and rain come into existence. By this mental sacrifice the ultimate origin of the water "cycle" is "explained".

¹⁶ *Kauṣītaki Upaniṣad* (Paris 1948), p. 34 n. 1.

¹⁷ JB. 1, 20.

¹⁸ Even this emended version, however, is not free from objections, as at least in KauṣU. 2, 5 the offering of speech in breath and of breath in speech is regarded as taking place during the whole day (and not every evening and morning). For this breath-speech sacrifice cf. Manu 4, 23 *vācy ehe juhvati prāṇam prāṇe vācam ca sarvadā*.

¹⁹ See section A of this chapter (referring to TB. 2, 1, 6, 5).

²⁰ How far this passage represents an attempt to assimilate the śrauta ritual and its brāhmaṇa speculations to an incipient movement of non-sacrificing or mental sacrificing, is hard to say.

²¹ Especially JB. 1, 20, where breathing is taken as an agnihotra.

²² See TB. 1, 4, 9, 2; ŚB. 2, 2, 2, 6 (see Kane, *Hist. of Dharmas. II*, p. 758). Samvartasmṛti 12 prescribes *sāyamprātar dvijātīnām āsanam śruticoditam/ nāntarā bhojanam kuryād agnihotrasamo vidhiḥ*. Parāśaramādhava, p. 370 f., *Smṛticandrikā II*, p. 609 and *Gṛhashtaratnākara*, p. 313 ascribe this rule to Manu (with *manuṣyāṇām* for *dvijātīnām*, *devanirmītam* for *śruticoditam* and *kāryam* for *kuryād* in the *Gṛhashtaratnākara* quotation). It is not found in the transmitted Manusmṛti.

CHAPTER SIX

THE "PRODUCTIVE" AND THE "CONSERVATIVE" AGNIHOTRA

A. The eating of food regarded as an agnihotra

So far we have only been concerned with an agnihotra which was regarded as maintaining the *āhitāgni*'s *prāṇāḥ* (life), the cosmic process of time, or both. According to some these continuous processes of life themselves are the agnihotra. Because the fires are identified with the *prāṇāḥ* the lifelong offering of oblations provides the food which sustains these *prāṇāḥ*. Eating food then came to be (as a *prāṇāgnihotra*) the substitute of the offering in the fires. On the other hand eating food (without any ritualistic aspects) forms an important link in the chain of the agnihotra concept which I would call "productive" or "creative" in distinction to the "conservative" or "static" agnihotra of the preceding sections. This agnihotra does not aim at maintaining the agnihotrin's present life, but at the development of a new human being, of a new existence of the "sacrificer". The eating of food is a creative agnihotra, as is the shedding of seed (produced by that food) in the wife. This concept of the agnihotra is based on a fertility or water doctrine which derives all life on earth from the heavenly water sent to earth in the form of rain.

B. The water doctrine

Frauwallner, *Gesch. d. ind. Philos. I*, p. 49 f., dealing with the "Wasserlehre" seems to ascribe the original form of this theory as it is found KauṣU. 1, 2 to the kṣatriyas. In his opinion the *pañcāgnividyā* passages (ChU. 5, 3 ff.; BĀU. 6, 2) in which the course of the water is symbolically described as a succession of five sacrifices were a later priestly adaptation of this doctrine.¹ See also U. Schneider, "Die altindische Lehre vom Kreislauf des Wassers", *Saeculum* 12, p. 1 ff., who observes that "der Predigttext der Fünf-Feuer-Lehre — im Gegensatz zu der in ihm enthaltene Wasserlehre — aus dem Geist der brahmanischen Opfermagie entstanden ist".² It should be observed that the so-called priestly adaptation of the water doctrine

in the *pañcāgnividyā* is expounded by a kṣatriya and that again a kṣatriya describes this doctrine in terms of a fivefold sacrifice in a passage discussed in the next section.³ Moreover the essential difference between the *pañcāgnividyā* passages and KauṣU. 1, 2 (which does not have this sacrificial symbolism) is not great. The assumption that a water doctrine of "Naturphilosophen"⁴ (kṣatriyas?) was adapted by brāhmaṇic priests to a sacrificial theory (*pañcāgnividyā*) has therefore hardly any foundation. One should not look at the presentation of the ideas, but at the contents. The kṣatriyas indeed play a striking role in several passages in which the water doctrine appears, but there is no reason for assuming that an entirely new theory from the "Naturphilosophie" was introduced into the priestly circles and consequently presented in an adapted, priestly form. The basic conception of a water doctrine (without the transmigration theory⁵ with which it is connected in KauṣU. 1, 2 and in the *pañcāgnividyā* passages of BĀU. and ChU.) is already found in several older texts. It may be useful here to consider the starting-points. Frauwallner (o.c., p. 49 f.) speaks of a "Wasserkreislauf": moon, rain, plants, food, semen, a new human being, cremation, rise to the moon, new cycle. This cycle, however, forms a later development. Originally the only conception (based on simple observation) was that fertility in the earthly vegetation depends on rain. This vegetation also forms the food of living beings and as such rain forms part of a theory on *annam* or life.⁶ The next step in this development is the result of eating food which does not only maintain life but also produces a new sap. The milk of cows is the product of this food⁷ and among the male animals seed, which produces new animals as the last phase of the water doctrine in purely ritualistic passages.⁸ Man in fact also belongs to the category of the *paśavaḥ* (the mammals) and indeed passages are not wanting in which the origin of man from the heavenly waters is described (mostly in a mythic context; but myth is timeless). According to AĀ. 2, 1, 3 Prajāpati's seed is the gods, theirs is rain, the seed of rain is herbs, of herbs food, of food seed, of seed creatures.⁹ See also BĀU. 6, 4, 1 stating that the herbs are the essence (or sap: *rasa*) of the waters, the flowers the essence of herbs, fruits of flowers, man of fruits and seed of man.¹⁰ TU. 2, 1 describes the origin of man from the ātman by way of *ākāśa*, wind, fire, water, earth, plants, food, seed.¹¹ All these passages refer only to a lineal and non-cyclic course of the fertile fluid. Very early, however, the idea had already been expressed that the

waters which have come to the earth return to heaven. The sun draws up the water which it has rained down.¹² Out of the smoke of the fire new rain is produced in heaven.¹³ This may be regarded as a cycle or rather as an exchange between heaven and earth, gods and men. There is still no relation with human life, but the combination of the conceptions that human life has the heavenly waters as its origin and that by the smoke of the fire (i.e. also of the cremation fire) new waters are produced in heaven could easily create the idea of a cycle of human life in the water doctrine. Before discussing this "Wasserkreislauf" as it is found in the *pañcāgnividyā* and related passages we shall first deal with the water doctrine in connection with the agnihotra and the conception that eating food represents an agnihotra.

C. The water doctrine and the agnihotra

SāṅkhB. 2, 7 (ed. Sarma 2, 5, 4-13) describes how the gods created (and presumably still create) man from the waters by way of herbs and trees, fruit, food and seed (*te 'pām ūrdhvaṃ rasam udauhan tā oṣadhayaś ca vanaspatayaś ca samabhavan osadhīnām ca vanaspatīnām cordhvaṃ rasam udauhan . .*). The text states (before the quoted passage) that all pleasures of eating, drinking and cohabitation are based on food. The gods, trying to obtain these pleasures (*ānandāḥ*) from someone like themselves (*asmādṛśasya*) create man in the way described above. The conception behind this myth is apparently that all generation of progeny on earth depends (in accordance with the water doctrine) on the general principle of fertility and life: *annam*. The passage continues with a description of the superiority of *vāc* (instead of the usual *prāṇa*) over the other *prāṇāḥ*, which serves here as an introduction for the statement that man is *vānmaya*. This takes us at last again to the subject of the agnihotra: The *vānmaya* agnihotrin becomes *satyamaya* by speaking the truth, i.e. the agnihotra formulas *agnir jyotir jyotir agniḥ* and *sūryo jyotir jyotiḥ sūryaḥ* (2, 8; ed. Sarma 2, 6, 1 ff.). The gods themselves are *satyamaya* and so their problem *katham nu imān vayam ānandān asmādṛśasyaiva pratigrhṇīyāma* (2, 7; ed. Sarma 2, 5, 3) has been solved: *tasyaitāṃ devāḥ satyahutasyāhutīm pratigrhṇanti* (2, 8; resp. 2, 6, 7). The gods receive back the *ānandāḥ* which they had brought on earth in the form of agnihotra libations. The connection between the water doctrine and the agnihotra has been made, but the

theory is still rather vague and unsystematical. One is more reminded of the old Prajāpati myths explaining the origin and function of the agnihotra than of the later starting-points for philosophical doctrines. Note that two conceptions, the origin of man from the heavenly waters and the paying back by sacrifice of the gifts from heaven, are mixed and that a complete cycle, which would imply the ascent to heaven of man himself (the last product of the water doctrine), is not expressed. Sacrifice and not natural philosophy with an explanation of a cyclic course of life is the subject of this passage. Does the great stress on the aspect of truth¹⁴ represent a reflection of the *satyavāda* to which the next passage¹⁵ refers? A similar, though basically different, conception of the agnihotra as returning to the gods the food which is theirs is found ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 10 f. Man subsists on rooted (herbs) and rootless (animals) food which belongs to the gods. The rootless cows eat the rooted herbs and consequently produce milk, which therefore represents the essence of all fertility or food which is sent by the gods. This milk is offered to them in the agnihotra.

A more developed theory is put forth by king Janaka, who teaches Yājñavalkya the *utkrānti*, *gati*, *pratiṣṭhā*, *tr̥pti*, *punarāvṛtti* and *loka pratyutthāyin* of the two libations (ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 4 ff.). These rise to the *antarikṣam*, thence to heaven, return to the earth, enter into man and finally into his wife in five successive sacrifices, which in some points resemble the *pañcāgnividyā* of BĀU., ChU. and JB. The eating of food and cohabitation of people who know thus are explicitly called an agnihotra¹⁶ and the son produced by the last of the five sacrifices is the *loka pratyutthāyin*. Does this text imply a definite knowledge of the theory of rebirth? I do not think so. Rebirth on earth in the transmigration doctrine is connected with the karma theory which teaches that man is reborn in accordance with his behaviour in a former life and may be liberated by knowledge or *tapas*. Even if the concept of karma may be lacking in the earliest phases of the rebirth doctrine, somehow a second life on earth after death must have been assumed. The agnihotrin who offers these libations, however, is not reborn after his life on earth, but produces a new existence already during his lifetime. Here we have an attempt to combine the theory that the father is reborn in his son with the agnihotra and the water doctrine. The direct production of the second self by procreation is doubled by the indirect way of the agnihotra water cycle. Janaka's theory is rather confused, as the child

which is born out of the fifth sacrifice (the cohabitation agnihotra) is not necessarily the son of the agnihotrin who by offering the libations started the cycle (which is indeed not a complete cycle). Perhaps we have to judge this passage differently. No personal, individual transmigration seems to be meant here. Janaka's words may be compared to the discussed passage of the ŚāṅkhB. The basic idea is the same: ultimately every offspring on earth is based on the heavenly fluid. Only the outlook has changed. In this process of reciprocity between heaven and earth ŚāṅkhB. starts from the central function of the gods, who send rain (which means food and life) to the earth and receive back the agnihotra oblation (material for a new dispatch of rain though not expressly said so) from their creatures. Janaka on the contrary makes the human sacrificer the starting-point in a theory which emphasizes the role of the sacrifice more than that of the gods. The daily performance of the rite, which in view of its permanent character is more "conservative" than "productive", creates or rather maintains the continuous stream of life which comes to the earth and as a result of which the incidental "productive" agnihotra of procreation can take place. In this concept of the agnihotra the offering of the oblation does not directly bear on the agnihotrin's life (there is no relation between fires and the *prāṇāḥ*), but maintains life in general and has to some extent a cosmic function. Taking food, here regarded as an agnihotra, only forms a link in the chain of the water doctrine and is considered merely from the point of view of production of seed and new life. In this *bhojana* agnihotra there is no connection with the *prāṇāgnihotra* and its underlying conceptions. Similar ideas on the sacrifice and its oblation (perhaps referring to the agnihotra¹⁷) are found MaiU. 6, 37: *atrodāharanti yad dhavir agnau hūyate tad ādityam gamayati tat sūryo raśmibhir varṣati tenānnaṃ bhavati [asmād bhūtānām utpattir iti. evaṃ hy āha: agnau prāstāhutiḥ samyag ādityam upatiṣṭhate | ādityāj jāyate vṛṣṭir vṛṣṭer annaṃ tataḥ prajāḥ ||]*.¹⁸

The water doctrine also forms the contents of the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo*, which occurs twice in the agnihotra section of JB. (1, 18; 1, 50) as the password of the deceased who on his way to the sun announces himself to the doorkeepers as the spiritual son of the Year, Time or the Sun. The seasons took his seed from the moon to his earthly father (apparently by way of food) and from that father shed it into his mother.¹⁹ The knowledge of this water doctrine, which here only refers to the origin of man from the heavenly waters, gives him

entrance to the sun. The context of JB. 1, 18 states that by offering the agnihotra in the āhavanīya (= the *devayoni*) one produces a second ātman in the *devaloka*, in the sun (1, 17). On arriving before the sun (after having recited the password *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo*) the deceased agnihotrin is interrogated by the sun (*kas tvam asi*) and either is admitted in his solar ātman (because he knows that he is identical with the sun), or he gets back his ātman which he had produced in the sun by the agnihotra, and is drawn away by the doorkeepers (the seasons). That this rejection implies a return to earth by way of the rain and according to the water doctrine as described in the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo*, is not mentioned in the text. If this would be the meaning of this passage and a transmigration doctrine were to be assumed here, one might expect that the author of the brāhmaṇa would have expounded this quite new rebirth theory more clearly. Presumably, however, no "Wasserkreislauf" has to be assumed here. The conception of the agnihotra libations is quite different from the one which occurs in Janaka's theory. Eating food is not mentioned (but implied) in this water doctrine, which has only a remote relation to the agnihotra and no relation at all to the prāṇāgnihotra. In the second JB. version (after a sūtra-like insertion on the funeral rites) reciting the verse immediately means deliverance and being accepted by the sun. The case of those who do not know the right answer to the doorkeeper's question *ko 'si puruṣa* (the answer apparently should be the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo*) is described JB. 1, 46 (before the inserted funeral ritual). The rejected deceased is transferred to a *dānājito lokaḥ* where he stays for some time to be ultimately reached by *punarmṛtyu*. Again there is no indication that this deceased will return to the earth and that the water doctrine implies a water cycle (the rejected deceased neither reaches moon nor sun). In this version the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo* and its underlying water doctrine have no clear relation to the agnihotra. The verse forms part of a *devayāna* description which starts at the end of JB. 1, 49 after the cremation in the sūtra-like passage on the funeral rites, but in fact belongs together with the *pitṛyāna* of JB. 1, 46 (a *pitṛyāna* without rebirth on earth) to the cremation sacrifice of JB. 1, 46 (beginning), which concludes (as in the upaniṣadic parallels) the *pañcāgnividyā* (of JB. 1, 45). This *pañcāgnividyā* as such has hardly any connection with the agnihotra. It describes in five successive sacrifices the descent of the waters (out of which man is born) from the sun: *eṣa vā agnir vaiśvānaro ya eṣa tapati* (..) *tasminn etasminn*

agnau vaiśvānare 'harahar devā amṛtam apo juhvati . . etc. The cremation in fact forms the sixth sacrifice: *tasminn etasminn agnau vaiśvānare 'har ahar devāḥ puruṣaṃ juhvati*. In the ensuing journey of the deceased to his origin, the sun, the question *ko 'si puruṣa* should be answered (as is done JB. 1, 50) with the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo*, which in other terms²⁰ contains the water doctrine of the *pañcāgnividyā* (JB. 1, 45). Man then returns to his immortal origin, where he stays in eternity. He has completed one cycle, but does not enter upon a new cycle. Nor does the less successful deceased, who fails to reach the starting-point of the cycle, but waiting for *punarmṛtyu* (the ordinary brāhmaṇa conception) stays in a *pitṛloka*, or as the text says a *dānājito lokaḥ*. So we may conclude that the water doctrine originally (i.e. in the discussed JB. passages 1, 18 and 1, 45-50) did not show any connection with rebirth. In its agnihotra aspect, which in JB. (agnihotra section!!) hardly plays a role (eating and cohabitation are nowhere explicitly called an agnihotra), there is no relation to the prāṇāgnihotra.

D. The *pañcāgnividyā* (ChU. 5, 3, 4 ff.; BĀU. 6, 2, 9 ff.) and KauṣU. 1, 2

As we have shown in the preceding section (C) neither the *pañcāgnividyā* nor the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo* (which also occurs KauṣU. 1, 2) originally had any connection with rebirth. In the upaniṣads, however, they were connected with the transmigration theory and a "Wasserkreislauf" may indeed be assumed. KauṣU. 1, 2 the moon as the doorkeeper of heaven asks the question "Who are you?" and either lets the deceased through (if he knows the right answer, the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo*²¹), or sends him back to earth in the form of rain,²² where he will be reborn as all sorts of animals or as a human being in accordance with his deeds and knowledge. Together with the transmigration doctrine a karma theory is introduced. Eating food as a link in the chain of the water cycle is not explicitly mentioned. There is no relation with the agnihotra or the prāṇāgnihotra.

The *pañcāgnividyā* passages of ChU. 5, 3, 4 ff. and BĀU. 6, 2, 9 ff. only differ from the discussed JB. parallel in their treatment of the two paths of the deceased and the introduction of the transmigration theory. Just as in KauṣU. 1, 2 the context nowhere refers to the agnihotra. Eating as the fourth of the five symbolic sacrifices has no relation with the prāṇāgnihotra. Varenne, o.c. II, p. 72 f. is of the

opinion that the whole fifth *prapāṭhaka* of ChU. and BĀU. 6, 1-2 deal with a secret *prāṇāgnihotra* doctrine and that these texts, being upaniṣads, do not describe the rite, but "enseignant à son propos les Corrélations, ce qui est le propre de ce genre de textes" (p. 72). Nevertheless "elles se devaient de reprendre les éléments essentiels du rite secret" and consequently one reads in these texts about an offering, "cette offrande étant constituée par une quintuple oblation (B.Ā.U. 6, 2, 9 à 13; Chānd-Up. 5, 4 à 9)" (p. 72). So Varenne seems to take the five offerings of the *pañcāgnividyā* (five successive offerings in yonder world, Parjanya, earth, man and wife) as somehow related with, or based on, the daily rite in which five oblations of food are offered in or to the five breaths or vital powers of the sacrificer. This is, to put it mildly, very surprising. The only connection between the *pañcāgnividyā* and the *prāṇāhuti* is the number five which is the number of the actual sacrificial fires and which is moreover a very current and important number in India.²³

The difference between the *pitryāna*/*devayāna* of KauṣU. 1, 2 and that of ChU. and BĀU. is that the division of the two paths in the latter version takes place on earth and not during the journey to heaven. The examination by the doorkeeper (the moon in KauṣU.; the *ṛtu* or one *ṛtu* in JB.) is omitted and from the cremation fire the deceased enters the *devayāna* (flame of the pyre, day, light half of the month, etc.) or the *pitryāna* (smoke of the pyre, night, etc.). The reason for this change is the following. In the passages of KauṣU. and JB. the only cause of liberation from rebirth (KauṣU.) or *punarmṛtyu* (JB.) was the right knowledge of one's origin from a divine, immortal source (i.e. the *pañcāgnividyā* water doctrine) and the insight that one is identical with the divine creator, the highest god, the sun. Brahman. This knowledge could be tested in the old mythical description of the journey to heaven somewhere at the door of heaven by means of the question "Who art thou?" Those who know the answer (the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo*) are identical with the knowers of the *pañcāgnividyā*, who according to ChU. and BĀU. are qualified for the *devayāna*. There are, however, in these texts more people who are admitted to the *devayāna*: *te ya evam etad viduḥ ye cāmī aranye śraddhām satyam upāsate te 'rcir abhisambhavanti* . . (BĀU. 6, 2, 15); *tad ya ittham vidur ye ceme 'ranye śraddhā tapa ity upāsate te 'rciṣam abhisambhavanti* . . (ChU. 5, 10, 1). The exact meaning of these two sentences with *upāsate* remains a point of debate.²⁴ This at least is definitely clear: besides knowledge of

one's own identity (which does not imply a special way of life with meditation, asceticism, etc.) a particular esoteric approach in the forests (which does not necessarily mean a permanent stay in those forests as a *vānaprastha* or *saṃnyāsin*) is also regarded as a qualification for the *devayāna*. The inclusion of this new group (which is explicitly opposed to sacrificers and givers of alms by the upaniṣads) excludes the mythical entrance-examination, knowledge no longer being the only criterion for entrance. Therefore the partition is already made on earth, automatically, on account of one's knowledge, esoteric practices and speculations or way of life. Now Varenne, speaking (o.c., p. 72 in connection with the fifth *prapāṭhaka* of ChU.) about "une doctrine du *prāṇāgnihotra* donnée comme secrète (elle est introduite par des formules du type '*ya evam veda*'²⁵) et concernant les gens qui vivent dans la forêt (*ya ime 'ranye*)", seems to have overlooked the fact that those people in the forest are not identical with the knowers of the *pañcāgnividyā*, that two groups are mentioned and that consequently we are not allowed simply to leave out *ca* in *ye cāmī aranye* (BĀU.) or *ye ceme 'ranye* (ChU.). Consequently, apart from the fact that the *pañcāgnividyā* itself has hardly any relation to the sacrifice in and to the breaths, this passage cannot be used to support Varenne's concept of the *prāṇāgnihotra* as a rite of *saṃnyāsins* and *vānaprasthas*. Varenne's remark (o.c., p. 73) "quant au bénéfice lointain, dernier, que l'on retirera de la pratique régulière du *prāṇāgnihotra*, ce sera de gagner, *post mortem*, le séjour d'ou l'on ne revient pas (B.Ā.U. 6, 2, 15; Chānd-Up. 5, 10, 1 et 2) par opposition au sort de ceux qui ne savent pas ainsi et qui renaîtront (B.Ā.U. 6, 2, 16; Chānd-Up. 5, 10, 3 à 6)" is likewise completely without any foundation.

NOTES

¹ "Erst später wurde sie (sc. the doctrine of the "Kreislauf des Wassers") von den Kreisen der brahmanischen Opferpriester übernommen, und diese Übernahme hat dazu geführt, ihr ein neues Gepräge zu geben. Die in der priesterlichen Gedankenwelt alles beherrschende Vorstellung vom Opfer als höchster Macht drängte sich auch hier ein und gab den Anlass, die wichtigsten Stufen im Kreislauf des Wassers als Opferungen zu betrachten" (o.c., p. 52).

² "Er (sc. the *pañcāgnividyā*) kann deshalb nur aus brahmanischen Kreisen, genauer: aus den Kreisen der Opferpriester, stammen. Und das stimmt zu der Tatsache, dass diese Opferpriester ein vitales Interesse hatten und haben mussten, sich gegen die Naturphilosophie, zu der ja unsere Wasserlehre zu rechnen ist, einzustellen" (o.c., p. 6).

³ Janaka describing the course of the *agnihotra* libations at ŚB. 11, 6, 2, 4 ff.

⁴ A separate group of "Naturphilosophen" developing a water doctrine, which formed a threat for the priestly circles of the brahmins and therefore had to be adapted and assimilated (see Schneider, o.c., p. 7), is hardly to be assumed. First the so-called "naturphilosophische Gedanke vom Wasser als lebenstragendem Element" (Frauwallner, o.c., p. 52) does not require this distinction between "Naturphilosophen" and "Opferpriester"; it is a rather old and fairly current thought, at least as far as the explanation of life on earth and fertility in general is concerned. Secondly it should be noted that the "Wasserkreislauf" in connection with human life cannot form the subject of entirely non-ritualistic speculations which were later incorporated in the priestly theories. The theory of the "Wasserkreislauf" does not explain (as "Naturphilosophie" should do) human life in general (from where do we come, where do we go after death?), but only the life of the ritualist. Without the cremation (with the own sacrificial fires) this "Wasserkreislauf" is quite impossible. The destiny of a samnyāsin who is not burnt by the fire after death lies completely beyond the scope of this theory. Only in the transmigration doctrine (with the *pitryāna* and *devayāna*), which in BĀU. and ChU. was secondarily combined with the original *pañcāgnividyā*, other groups (ChU. 5, 10, 1 *ye ceme rāṇye śraddhā tapa ity upāsate*; BĀU. 6, 2, 15 *ye cāmī arāṇye śraddhām satyam upāsate*) are going to play a role and sacrifice is regarded as a disqualification for reaching immortality. There, however, "Naturphilosophen" as well as "Opferpriester" disappear from the stage. As usual the kṣatriya influence seems to be connected more with the later transmigration doctrine than with the original "Wasserlehre". The *pañcāgnividyā* passages of ChU. and BĀU. (inclusive of the doctrine of the two paths; see section D of this chapter), far from being a priestly adaptation (hardly conceivable since the sacrifice is described as inferior in the *pitryāna/devayāna* passage, see ChU. 5, 10, 3; BĀU. 6, 2, 16), look more like a "progressive" adaptation claimed by kṣatriyas of a "priestly" doctrine or passage (see section C for the JB. version).

⁵ As found in KauṣU. 1, 2 and the *deva-pitryāna* passages of ChU. and BĀU., where a kṣatriya teaches this doctrine.

⁶ See ch. IV, n. 1.

⁷ ŚB. 1, 3, 1, 25; 2, 3, 1, 10; 2, 6, 3, 7.

⁸ ŚB. 3, 7, 4, 4; 4, 5, 1, 9 ("Der Vers *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo*", o.c., p. 844, n. 6). Cf. ŚB. 12, 9, 1, 16 *śiśnena vā annasya rasam retāḥ siñcati*.

⁹ The passage continues with a purely psychic development (heart-mind-speech-action). Cf. MNU. 533 f.

¹⁰ Only the beginning of this passage (*eṣām vai bhūtānām prthivī rasah prthivyā āpaḥ*) does not agree with the water doctrine.

¹¹ This refers to man in his corporeal aspect as being *annarasamaya* (one of the five *ātman*s or *kośa*s). See also TUBhV. 2, 163-165 (and J. M. van Boetzelaer's transl. with notes, thesis Utrecht 1971) on the development of seed from food.

¹² See Lüders, *Varuṇa* I, p. 308 ff.

¹³ RV. 1, 164, 51 *bhūmim parjanyaṁ jinvanti divam jinvanty agnayāḥ*. For further reference see n. 12. See also TS. 3, 2, 9, 7 and AB. 4, 27, 6. Compare ŚB. 9, 3, 3, 15 ff. on the course of the *vasor dhāvā* libation which comes to earth in the form of rain, is produced as milk by the cow and offered by the sacrificer. An eternal cycle of food is produced in this way. A similar idea is found ViṣṇP. 2, 9.

¹⁴ ŚāṅkhB. 2, 6, 7 (ed. Sarma) *tasyaitām devāḥ satyāhutasyāhutiṁ pratigrhṇanti*; 2, 6, 8/19 *rātryā/ahna u śirsant satyam vadati*; 2, 6, 9-10/20-

21 *sa yadi ha vā api tata ūrdhvaṁ mṛṣā vadati satyam haivāsyoditam bhavati*.

¹⁵ ŚāṅkhB. 2, 7, 12 *tad yathā ha vai śraddhādevasya satyavādinā tapasvino hutam bhavati*.

¹⁶ See ch. II, n. 10. Ruben (*Beginn der Philosophie in Indien*, p. 125), rightly interpreting this passage as "eine im Grunde ritualistische Wiedergeburtstheorie des Vaters im Sohn", is wrong in observing that "Wer Janakas Lehre weiss, wird von der Notwendigkeit des täglichen Feueropfers entbunden. Sein Essen und Lieben ersetzt ihm das Opfern; das ist eine geradezu antiritualistische Haltung". Nowhere does the text speak about replacing the agnihotra by eating. The agnihotra continues to be performed in order to produce the rain from heaven.

¹⁷ Van Buitenen (*The Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad*, p. 60) holds that the text "refers most concretely to the actual rite of the agnihotra".

¹⁸ The passage between brackets is rejected by van Buitenen (o.c., p. 59) as an insertion. The quotation *agnau prāstāhutiḥ* . . is found in Manu (3, 76). Compare BhG. 3, 14 *annād bhavanti bhūtāni parjanyaṁ annasambhavaḥ | yajñād bhavati parjanyaṁ yajñāḥ karmasamudbhavaḥ ||*

¹⁹ See my article "Der Vers *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo*", o.c., p. 847.

²⁰ This does not mean that the *pañcāgnividyā* (JB. 1, 45) and the verse *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo* (JB. 1, 50) form an original unity. Note that the *ṛtus* do not occur in the five sacrifices of the water doctrine, where the gods are active (*tasminn etasminn agnau vaiśvānare 'har ahar devāḥ . . juhvati*). Apparently the verse existed independently from the *pañcāgnividyā*. In JB. 1, 18 it seems to be more original.

²¹ See "Der Vers *vicakṣaṇād ṛtavo*", o.c., p. 845. The verse is evidently used in a secondary context, as appears from the voc. *ṛtavaḥ* (the moon here asks the question!).

²² Cf. JUB. 4, 8, 4, 4 *ya u ha vā evamvid asmāl lokāt praiti sa prāṇa eva vāyum apyeti vāyor adhy abhrāṇy abhrebhyo 'dhi vṛṣṭim vṛṣṭyaivemam lokam anuvibhavati*. Oertel, *J.A.O.S.* 16, p. 243 observes in a note: "It seems very probably that a negative should be supplied in the relative clause, in order to contrast this paragraph with the preceding one". If indeed *imam lokam anuvibhavati* refers to rebirth and the *pitryāna*, the negative is indispensable.

²³ See Gonda, *Viṣṇuism and Śivaism* (London 1970), p. 45 ff.

²⁴ The two upaniṣad versions do not agree. If ChU. *ye . . śraddhā tapa ity upāsate* should be taken with Senart (*Chāndogya Upaniṣad*, Paris 1930; see also his note on this passage) as "ceux . . qui connaissent que la mortification vaut la foi", asceticism is apparently the highest goal, whereas BĀU. 6, 2, 16 places *tapas* on a level with the lower activities (*ye yajñena dānena tapasā lokāṇ jayanti*). I doubt, however, whether *śraddhā* and *tapas* (or *satyam* in the BĀU. version) are identified. ChU. 5, 10, 3 (*atha ya ime grāma iṣṭāpūrtam dattam ity upāsate*) hardly favours the assumption of an identification. Perhaps one may take *upās-* in both passages as "to be engaged in, attached to". In the original version *iti* should in that case conclude an enumeration (which may have consisted of *śraddhā*, *satyam* and *tapas*; cf. ŚāṅkhB. 2, 7, 12 *tad yathā ha vai śraddhādevasya satyavādinā tapasvino hutam bhavati*).

²⁵ The expression *ya evam veda* (or *evam vidvān*, *evamvid*) is fairly current in the brāhmaṇas and hardly proves that we are concerned with secret forest rites, as Varenne seems to assume (o.c. II, p. 53 f.). A term such as *sāyujyam* (and *salokatā*), which is connected by Varenne (p. 52) with bhakti and Viṣṇu devotion, occurs in orthodox brāhmaṇa contexts (even in connection with *evam vidvān*): *agner/vāyor/adityasya/etc. devasya sāyujyam salokatām samabhyārohati ya evam vidvān agnihotraṁ juhoti* (JB. 1, 26-36).

CHAPTER SEVEN

THE PRĀṆĀGNIHOTRA RITUAL

The most elaborate description of the rite occurs in BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12 (Varenne, o.c. II, p. 82 ff.). See further VaiSmS. 2, 18 (Varenne, p. 76), PrāṇU. (ed. Varenne) and MaiU. 6, 9 (not mentioned by Varenne; according to van Buitenen¹ a later insertion in this upaniṣad, which deals with agnihotra and prāṇāgnihotra speculations). For the mantras see MNU. 473 ff. and Chāndogya Mantrapāṭha (Varenne, p. 92). The formulas *prāṇāya svāhā*... etc. are also found ChU. 5, 19 ff., where the rest of the ritual does not receive much attention. For a late, but very elaborate and interesting description of the rite see the Appendix.

The performer sits down on a place which has been cleansed and smeared with cowdung, honours the food with *bhūr bhuvah suvar om*, restrains his speech² and pours water around the food with the *mahāvyaḥrtis* (BDhŚ.). PrāṇU. 5-15 mentions several mantras for the consecration of the food and the purification of the sacrificer (i.a. *āpaḥ punantu pṛthivīm pṛthivī pūtā punātu mām*... and *yad ucchiṣṭam abhojyam vā*... *sarvaṃ punantu mām āpo*...). According to MaiU. the *manas* is purified by means of the *ucchiṣṭopahata* mantra (*ucchiṣṭocchiṣṭopahataṃ yac ca pāpena dattam*...). Then the sacrificer drinks or sips water with *amṛtopastaraṇam asi* ("Thou art the underlay of the immortal (food)"; MNU.; ChMP.; BDhŚ.; in VaiSmS. recited at the sprinkling of the food). PrāṇU. has *amṛtam asy amṛtopastaraṇam asy amṛtam prāṇe juhomy amāśiṣyānto 'si*,³ whereas MaiU. only states that he encloses the food with water before the meal (*adbhiḥ purastāt paridadhāti*). After dinner (of which the *prāṇāhuti* forms the introduction) the formula runs *amṛtāpidhānam asi* ("Thou art the cover⁴ of the immortal (food)"); here PrāṇU. has *amṛtāpidhānam asy amṛtāya tvopadadhāmi*. MaiU. again only mentions the enclosing or covering of the food without any formula and VaiSmS. has after (and before) the meal the mantra *ūrjaskaram*... for the drinking of water.⁵ The formulas of the *prāṇāhuti* are *prāṇāya svāhā*, *apānāya svāhā*,... etc.⁶ (ChMP.; ChU.; MaiU.; PrāṇU.; VaiSmS.). Only MNU. and BDhŚ. have different formulas: *śraddhāyam* (only in MNU.) *prāṇe* (*apāne* etc.) *niviṣṭo*

'mṛtam juhomi śivo mā viśāpradāhāya prāṇāya (apānāya etc.) svāhā. In MNU. follows *brahmaṇi ma ātmāmṛtatvāya* (485). VaiSmS. and PrāṇU. have special prescriptions on the use of the fingers for each of the five oblations. The latter text moreover has *tūṣṇīm ekām ekarṣau juhōti dve āhavanīya ekām dakṣiṇāgnāv ekām gārhapatyā ekām sarvaprāyaścittīye* (19) between the *prāṇāhuti* and the formula for the final sipping of water. The fires mentioned in the quotation are later (28 ff.) said to be situated in the human body. According to Varenne⁷ the *prāṇāhuti* of 17-18 and this offering in the five (internal) fires are identical and simultaneous. This would imply that *tūṣṇīm* (19) also refers to the formulas of the *prāṇāhuti*. If, however, a formula has to be recited silently (i.e. in thought) this is mostly indicated in a more intelligible way. Moreover Varenne's interpretation implies that *juhōti* with locative should mean in the same context and referring to the same ritual action "to offer to" (18: *prāṇe juhōti*) as well as "to offer in" (19: *juhōti*... *āhavanīye*). There is no logical connection between the five *prāṇāh* and (the seat of) the five internal fires. The twofold offering in the (internal) *āhavanīya* (19) does not agree with the five single *prāṇāhutis*.

It is therefore my assumption that a different rite with internal fires has been inserted (by the author of the upaniṣad or later) in the prāṇāgnihotra. After the explanation of these fires (27-32) the text continues with an interpretation of a sacrifice in the body (*asya śarīrayajñasya*...; 33) as an internal rite (the *ātman* is the *yajamāna*, the *buddhi* his *patni*) which obviously is not based on the agnihotra and has no relation at all with the prāṇāgnihotra.⁸

With the sipping of water (*amṛtāpidhānam asi*) the proper sacrifice and the meal ends. There are, however, some additional ritual actions. The sacrificer should touch his heart with *prāṇānām granthir asi rudro mā viśāntakas tenānnenāpyāyasva* (MNU. 498; BDhŚ.). VaiSmS., where the abdomen is touched (*udaram abhimṛṣet*), only prescribes the formula *om prāṇān āpyāyasva*, whereas in MaiU. and PrāṇU. the mantras *prāṇo 'gnih paramātmā*... and *viśvo 'si vaiśvānaro*... are recited at the touching of the heart (PrāṇU.) or the concentration on the self or the cosmic *ātman* (MaiU.: *ātmānam abhi-dhyāyet*). Water is poured out on the great toe of the right foot with *aṅguṣṭhamātraḥ puruṣo 'ṅguṣṭhaṃ ca samāśritaḥ iśaḥ sarvasya jagataḥ prabhuh priṇāti viśvabhug* (MNU. 492 f.; BDhŚ.). Here VaiSmS. prescribes *aṅor aṅiyān*..., PrāṇU. *mahādevo 'yam puruṣo yo 'ṅguṣṭhāgre pratiṣṭhitaḥ*... and MaiU. does not have any further information

on the ritual. Some verses from MNU. apparently to be recited after the meal are not found in the other prāṇāgni-hotra contexts (not even in BDhŚ.). Only in BDhŚ. and MNU. a *hutānumantra* occurs: *śraddhāyām prāṇe (apāne etc.) niviśyāmṛtaṃ hutam prānam (apānam etc.) annenāpyāyasva* (MNU. 487 ff., where its position right after the mantras of the *prāṇāhuti* itself seems to be more original than in BDhŚ.). The *hutānumantra* concludes with *brahmaṇi ma ātmāmṛtatvāyety ātmānam, akṣareṇa cātmanam yojayet* "Ensuite s'adressant à son Ame, il récite 'puisse mon Ame atteindre l'immortalité en brahman!' Qu'il attelle alors son Ame au moyen de l'impérissable (syllabe: Om)!" (BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 13-14, tr. Varenne). This mantra is indeed found in MNU. (478 and 485, where, however, it comes after the formulas of the *prāṇāhuti* and not after the *hutānumantra*), but the elliptic construction *ity ātmānam* looks suspicious, Varenne's "s'adressant à son Ame" hardly being more than a guess.⁹

Concluding this survey of the rather simple prāṇāgni-hotra ritual I should like to observe that a basic pattern of the rite can be discerned: mantras to be recited before the *prāṇāhuti* itself; sipping or drinking of water (*amṛtopastaraṇam asi*); the *prāṇāhuti* (*prāṇāya svāhā* etc.); sipping or drinking of water after the meal which forms the continuation of the *prāṇāhuti* (*amṛtāpidhānam asi*); touching of the central seat of the *prāṇāḥ* (with various mantras); pouring of water on the toe (with various mantras); other mantras to be recited. The relation between MNU. and BDhŚ. which, even at the *prāṇāhuti* itself, have mantras or formulas without any parallels in the other discussed texts is striking. The ritual is fairly uniform in all the mentioned texts, only the mantras show many differences. It should be mentioned that the prāṇāgni-hotra as it is described in these texts (which at least partly have the function of ritual handbooks) forms a *bhojanavidhi*, a ceremony of dining, to be regarded as one of the usual daily ceremonies. It is not my assumption that the whole *bhojanavidhi* was from the outset identical with the prāṇāgni-hotra version of the ordinary agnihotra. Perhaps originally the prāṇāgni-hotra only consisted of the *prāṇāhuti* as such with the five formulas *prāṇāya svāhā* etc., as may also be seen in the old ChU. passage on the prāṇāgni-hotra. The rest of the elaborate *bhojanavidhi* may be a later addition or belong to the original *bhojanavidhi* (i.e. before it was combined with the prāṇāgni-hotra). Note that ChU. 5, 2, 2 and BĀU. 6, 1, 14 refer to sipping water before and after the meal without any explicit relation to the prāṇāgni-hotra. ChU. even

uses the expression *purastāc copariṣṭāc cādbhiḥ paridadhāti* (cf. MaiU. 6, 9 *adbhiḥ purastāt paridadhāti . . ato 'dbhir bhūya evopariṣṭāt paridadhāti*). According to the BĀU. version *śrotriyā aśiṣyanta ācāmanty aśitvācāmanti*. The term *śrotriya* mostly denotes those orthodox brahmins who have studied the śruti and would hardly be applicable to some adherents of a prāṇāgni-hotra which is taught as something completely new in the same adhyāya of the upaniṣad.¹⁰ We may safely assume that this sipping of water was already traditional and that perhaps even the formulas (which address the water as the *upastaraṇam* and *apidhānam*, i.e. the enclosing, cf. ChU. *paridadhāti*) were already connected with this action before the inclusion of the *prāṇāhuti* in the *bhojanavidhi*. These formulas are indeed also found in connection with the much older *madhuparka*.¹¹

NOTES

¹ The *Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad*, p. 44.

² As is done by the *yajamāna* and the *adhvaryu* in the agnihotra ritual from the lading out of the milk up to the offering of the oblation.

³ For the addition of *amṛtam asi* cf. GB. 1, 1, 39. Varenne rightly takes *amā, śiṣya, ānto 'si* (for the division of the words see also Deussen's note to his translation) as a corruption. Does the text contain a corrupt future participle of *aś-* "to eat"? For *ama-* (= *prāṇa*) and *amā* cf. ChU. 5, 2, 6 *amo nāmāsy amā hi te sarvam idam* (the par. BĀU. 6, 3, 5 has *āmāṃsy amāṃ hi te mahi*).

⁴ As the counterpart of *upastaraṇam* one would expect *abhighāraṇa* or *abhighāra*, as the counterpart of *apidhānam* on the other hand *pātram* (cf. BGS. 2, 10, 36 *prīhivī te pātram dyaur apidhānam*). On account of ChU. 5, 2, 2 and BĀU. 6, 1, 14 one may assume that *upastaraṇam* and *apidhānam* represent a wrapping of the food, not as a real *vāsas*, but as a dish with a cover (both probably consisting of leaves), in fact a protection against cold or cooling down.

⁵ VaiSmS. 9, 14 (a *bhojanavidhi* in the *dharma* section) correctly prescribes the formulas *amṛtopastaraṇam asi* and *amṛtāpidhānam asi* for the drinking of water before and after eating. According to most texts the water is drunk and not sipped (*ācamana*). After the final drinking, however, water is sipped before the touching of the heart: *apaḥ pītṛvācānto hṛdayadeśam abhimṛśati* (BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 10). Varenne's interpretation of this sentence *pītṛvā ca anto* (o.c., p. 82) is surprising. In this context *ācāntaḥ* is quite normal; it is moreover resumed by *punar ācamya* (2, 7, 12, 11).

⁶ The usual order is *prāṇāya, apānāya, vyānāya, udānāya, samānāya*, but MaiU. places *samāna* before *udāna* and the order in ChU. (*prāṇa, vyāna, apāna, samāna, udāna*) and ChMP. (*prāṇa, apāna, samāna, udāna, vyāna*) is entirely different.

⁷ O.c., p. 113, n. 10.

⁸ Cf. MNU. 543 ff. (*. . ātmā yajamānaḥ śraddhā patnī . . etc.*) and the prāṇāgni-hotra passage VaiSmS. 2, 18 (*svayamjyotiṣ ātmā yajamāno buddhiḥ patnī . .*). Cf. also VāsDhŚ. 30, 5 (the brahmin whom one feeds is a sacrifice,

his *prāṇāḥ* represent the priests, etc.) and 30, 8 (mental sacrifice). These upaniṣadic or upaniṣad-like passages refer to mental sacrifices which have no relation to the *prāṇāgni*hotra. Sacrifice in general is the subject. Food even does not form the oblation in most cases. Man and his life are a sacrifice. Abstract conceptions such as *ahiṃsā* play a role. This *adhyātmam* approach of the sacrifice may have been current in the circles of non-sacrificers such as *saṃnyāsins*. For an explicit connection made with the *agnihotra* see JB. 1, 19 and ŚB. 11, 3, 1, 1 ff. Starting-points for the *adhyātmam* interpretation of the great *śrauta* sacrifices (in combination with the *agnihotra*, which one always tries to homologize with these sacrifices) are found in the *brāhmaṇas*, e.g. TB. 2, 1, 5, 9: *prāṇo vā agnihotrasyāśrāvitaṃ, apānaḥ pratyāśrāvitaṃ, mano hotā, cakṣur brahmā, nimeṣo vaṣatkāraḥ*.

⁹ Compare BGS. 2, 11, 38 (with which we shall deal in the next chapter on the *śrāddha bhojanam*), where *ity ātmānam* in a similar context is to be connected with the predicate *saṃkṣate* (to be supplied from the preceding sentence). On the other hand, however, the text of BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 13-14 as edited by Hultsch (and adopted by Varenne) may be not reliable. See ch. XI., n. 4, 9 and 13.

¹⁰ ChU. 5, 19 ff. deal with the *prāṇāgni*hotra. For *adbhiḥ paridadhati* (ChU. 5, 2, 2) see IX B.

¹¹ The formula *amṛtopastaraṇam asi* is found BGS. 1, 2, 32; ĀpMB. 2, 10, 3; HirGS. 1, 13, 6; ĀśvGS. 1, 24, 13; MGS. 1, 9, 15; VārGS. 11, 12; KāthGS. 24, 14; VaiGS. 2, 16; ĀgnGS. 2, 6. For *amṛtāpidhānam asi* see BGS. 1, 2, 41; ĀpMB. 2, 10, 4; HirGS. 1, 13, 9; ĀśvGS. 1, 24, 28; MGS. 1, 9, 17; VārGS. 11, 19; VaiGS. 2, 16; ĀgnGS. 2, 6. Mostly these formulas are used at the sipping of water before and after the consumption of the *madhuparka*. VaiGS. 2, 16 also prescribes the formula for the giving of the *mukhavāsa*. See further GB. 1, 1, 39 (dealing with the *ācamana* in general) *amṛtam asy amṛtopastaraṇam asi* (cf. PrānU.) *amṛtāya tvopastṛṇāmīti pānāv udakam āñīya* (the *ācamana* is performed with other formulas). Honey often being identified with *amṛtam* and the *madhuparka* ceremony no doubt being anterior to the *prāṇāgni*hotra one may assume that these two formulas originally belonged to the *madhuparka*, from which they were transferred to other *bhojanas*. They already belonged to the *bhojanavidhi* when the *bhojana* came to be regarded as a *prāṇāgni*hotra. We shall see in the next chapter that in later times these formulas were used even in the *pūjā* and *śrāddha*.

CHAPTER EIGHT

THE BHOJANAM IN THE ŚRĀDDHA RITUAL AND ITS RELATION TO THE PRĀṆĀGNIHOTRA

BGS. 2, 11, 38, dealing with the *bhojanam* of the brahmins in the *aṣṭakā* ritual, states: *bhuñjānān saṃkṣate prāṇe nivīṣṭo 'mṛtaṃ juhomīti pañcabhiḥ brahmaṇi ma ātmāmṛtatvāyety ātmānam* (sc. *saṃkṣate*). Cf. BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 12 f. *śrāddhāyāṃ prāṇe nivīṣyāmṛtaṃ hutaṃ prāṇam annenāpyāyasveti pañcabhiḥ¹ brahmaṇi ma ātmāmṛtatvāyety ātmānam*.² In the *gṛhyasūtra* the elliptic construction *ity ātmānam* does not form a problem. Are we to conclude that BDhŚ. or at least some of its mss. have carelessly borrowed from BGS.? It is striking that these *śrāddha* formulas as well as the related *prāṇāgni*hotra formulas (with *prāṇe nivīṣṭo* / *nivīṣya*) are especially found in Taittirīya texts. For the *śrāddha* version one may compare HirGS. 2, 11, 5-12, 1 *prāṇe nivīṣyāmṛtaṃ juhomīti. bhuñjānān saṃkṣate brahmaṇi ma ātmāmṛtatvāyety*, where apparently a full stop after *juhomīti* should not be retained.³ Cf. also ĀgnGS. 3, 3, 2 (*śrāddhaśeṣa*) and 3, 11, 3 (*saṃpīṇḍikaraṇam*): *bhuñjānān saṃkṣate prāṇe nivīṣṭo 'mṛtaṃ juhomi (iti) brahmaṇi ma ātmāmṛtatvāyety*. In the other Taittirīya texts the sacrificer does not watch the eating brahmins while reciting the *prāṇāgni*hotra-like mantras. ĀpGS. 8, 21, 9 makes the sacrificer eat the remains of the *śrāddha bhojanam* with these formulas (= ĀpMB. 2, 20, 26) and BhārGS. 2, 14 prescribes for the same occasion: . . . *tan naḥ saha devair amṛtam astu prāṇeṣu tvāmṛtaṃ juhomi svāhā*.⁴ A paddhati of the Āpastambīyas (see Caland, *Ahnen-cult*, p. 48), however, states that the brahmins should be fed "ganz in der weise des täglichen essens (*nityabhojanam*), nur lassen sie die spenden hinweg.⁵ Während er die sprüche aus dem Taitt. Ār. (i.e. the mantras *prāṇe nivīṣṭo* . . . etc.) hersagt, blicke er sie an" (Caland, o.c., p. 57). See also *Śrāddhamañjarī* (Ān. S. G. 59), p. 56 (dealing with the *darśaśrāddha*) *viprāś ca nityabhojanavat pariṣecanam kṛtvā balidānavarjam amṛtopastaraṇam asīty āpośanam kṛtvā prāṇāhutir gṛhṇīyuh. kartā ca prāṇāhutimantrān paṭhet. śrāddhāyāṃ prāṇe nivīṣṭo 'mṛtaṃ juhomi śivo māviśāpradāhāya svāhā* . . . etc. *brahmaṇe svāhā. prāṇāya svāhā. apānāya svāhety evaṃ vā*. Here apparently the *prāṇāgni*hotra formulas⁶ have been transferred to the

śrāddha bhojanam. Compare also Kane, *Hist. of Dharmaś.* IV, p. 496 dealing with a modern *parvaṇaśrāddha*, where all the prāṇāgnihoṭra formulas as found in MNU. 480-485 are used and *brahmaṇe svāhā* (which in the quoted passage above replaces *brahmaṇi ma ātmāmṛtatvāya*) is added. In the old śrāddha passages, however, the mantras recited by the sacrificer are not completely identical with the prāṇāgnihoṭra formulas of MNU. 480-485 (cf. BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 3). The prāṇāhutis *prāṇāya svāhā* .. etc. and *śivo māviśāpradāhāya*⁷ are not included.

It is remarkable that before the proper prāṇāgnihoṭra formulas 479-486⁸ the mantra collection of MNU. exhibits the same formulas as in the śrāddha passages (i.e. with the omission of *prāṇāya svāhā*⁹ .. and *śivo māviśa* ..). Only *śraddhāyām* (which, however, is missing in the TĀ. ed.) is not found in the śrāddha version. Presumably MNU. 473-478 and 480-485 do not constitute optional prāṇāgnihoṭra formulas,¹⁰ but the ordinary (prāṇāgnihoṭra) bhojanavidhi mantras preceded by their variants from the śrāddha bhojana.¹¹ How should one interpret the relation between the prāṇāgnihoṭra and the śrāddha? If the formulas were simply transferred from the one bhojana (the *nityabhojana* or prāṇāgnihoṭra) to the other (the śrāddha bhojana), as it seems to be the case in later times, this would prove that already in the period of the old gṛhyasūtras (like BGS. and HirGS., which do not mention a prāṇāgnihoṭra ceremony) this prāṇāgnihoṭra was not an esoteric rite (for saṃnyāsins as Varrenne assumes), but a regular bhojanavidhi of the householder. The following development, however, may be more plausible. The original formulas of the prāṇāgnihoṭra were only formed by the prāṇāhutis *prāṇāya svāhā* .. etc. (as found in the oldest source ChU. and in VaiSmS., PrāṇU. and MaiU.) preceded and followed by the *āpośāna* formulas (taken from the madhuparka bhojana?). It is difficult to discern whether the rest of the mantras (recited before and after the meal) was added later. The general idea of a sacrifice (to and in the ḍreaths as the substitute of the fires seems to have been transferred by the Taittirīyas to the śrāddha ritual, in which the invited brahmins act as substitutes for the fires.¹² It should be noted that the brahmins do not only represent the three *pītaras* and the gods¹³ in the mentioned śrāddha passage of BGS. The five brahmins also function in a cosmic sacrifice. At BGS. 2, 10, 36 (and in several parallels) the sacrificer touches the food with *prthivī te pātram dyaaur apidhānam brahmaṇas tvā mukhe juhomi brāhmaṇānām tvā vidyāva-*

tām prāṇāpānāyor juhomi " The earth is thy vessel,¹⁴ heaven is the lid (i.e. this food represents all the food of the cosmos). I offer thee in the mouth of brahman (the cosmic principle, which creates and consumes all food and life, here conceived as an eating person). I offer thee in the ex- and inhalation of learned brahmins (who are in fact the human representatives of brahman)". This sacrifice in the mouth of brahman seems to be regarded as a cosmic prāṇāgnihoṭra in which the five brahmins represent the five fires or *prāṇāḥ* of the eating brahman.¹⁵ This interpretation (which I propose with some hesitation) may explain the use of the term *niviṣṭa*- in the five formulas, which in the context of the prāṇāgnihoṭra is not easy to explain.¹⁶ The sacrificer (*śraddhāyām*, i.e. in faith, not actually¹⁷) enters into, or distributes himself over, the five brahmins, who each represent one of the five *prāṇāḥ* of brahman. He offers the *amṛtam*, the food, in the mouth of brahman and enters himself into brahman:¹⁸ *brahmaṇi ma ātmāmṛtatvāya*. From the śrāddha bhojana (which, as the mantras show, has no relation to ancestor worship in this case) the formulas seem to have been transferred by the Taittirīyas to the prāṇāgnihoṭra bhojana and added to the prāṇāhutis (*prāṇāya svāhā* .. etc.).¹⁹ The confusion of the śrāddha and prāṇāgnihoṭra bhojana-mantras was natural (especially since they occurred side by side in the mantrapāṭha of TĀ. 10 or MNU., if my hypothesis is right). The late Taitt. sūtra ĀgnGS. (2, 4, 10) even gives the prāṇāgnihoṭra formulas (*amṛtopastaraṇam asi*; *prāṇe niviṣṭo 'mṛtam juhomi śivo mā viśāpradāhāya prāṇāya svāhā* .. etc.; *brahmaṇi ma ātmāmṛtatvāya* is missing) in its description of the *devatārādhana*. In that *pūjā* ceremony the *naivedya* is, in fact, a bhojana. The prāṇāgnihoṭra bhojana seems to have been transferred to every sort of bhojana (even if one does not eat the food oneself, but offers it to others, in this case the deity). The *naivedya* description remarkably agrees with the bhojana of ĀgnGS. 2, 6, 7. On the other hand this offering of food to the deity, like other items of the *pūjā*, seems to form a continuation of śrāddha practices (the honouring of invited brahmins), as is rightly observed by Kane, *Hist. of Dharmaś.* II, p. 730. The *naivedya* formulas are, however, mostly the prāṇāhutis of the ordinary daily bhojana.²⁰ According to the late Gautamasmṛti (10, 68; quoted from Caland, "Der Gautamaśrāddhakalpa. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte und Literatur der Sāmavedaschulen", *Bijdr. T.L.V.*, 1895, p. 103) the sacrificer inter alia recites the *prāṇāgnihoṭrakhaṇḍa* while the brahmins take their food in the śrāddha cere-

mony. Caland, o.c., p. 104 observes: "Welcher text mit prāṇagnihotrakhaṇḍa gemeint ist, sehe ich nicht; die upaniṣad? oder entspricht *devakṛtasyetyaṣṭau* des śrāddhakalpa?" So much is clear that even if *prāṇe niviṣṭo* . . etc. (as in BGS.) is meant (which seems doubtful), reciting a prāṇagnihotra text in this late smṛti only functions as a recitation. The formulas do not accompany definite ritual actions.

NOTES

1 In his first edition (reproduced by Varenne, o.c., p. 81) Hultzsich reads *pañca*, in the second (*Das Baudhāyana-Dharmasūtra*, Leipzig 1922) *pañcabhiḥ*. This second edition moreover includes the text of all the five formulas. However *iti pañcabhiḥ* probably implies that only the first formula should be read (as in BGS.). Does the omission of the other four mean that they (and their correct order) were known from a mantrapāṭha (like MNU.)?

2 The second edition omits *ātmānam*. See also ch. VII, n. 9.

3 Caland, *Altindischer Ahnencult* (Leiden 1893), p. 62 translates "Während sie essen, blickt er sie an mit den Worten: 'möge meine seele in Brahman zur Unsterblichkeit gelangen'", and connects the touching of the food (with the thumbs of the brahmins) with the formulas *prāṇe niviṣyāmytam juhomi* (recited by the sacrificer), which is evidently wrong. Probably he had no other choice, this passage being either incorrectly borrowed from BGS. or corruptly transmitted. It should be observed that, if the full stop after *juhomi* is removed, the formula *brahmaṇi ma ātmāmytatvāya* cannot be construed in the context.

4 In Āp. the use of the mantras is secondary. There are not five brahmins, five fires or five oblations corresponding to the five *prāṇāḥ*. The text only states that at least one mouthful should be taken.

5 Does "die spenden" refer to the prāṇāhutis in the original (which I could not use)? Compare, however, *balidānavarjam* in the quotation from the *Śrāddhamañjarī* to be mentioned further on and see in the same work p. 69 *viprāś cānam pariṣṭeya balidānavarjam āpoṣanam kṛtvā prāṇāhutiḥ ghṛitvoktaniyamayuktā bhuñjīran*, where the balis and not the prāṇāhutis are omitted. See also *Smṛticandrikā*, *śrāddhakāṇḍa*, p. 349 *āpoṣanādānavidhānān nityabhojanāśritaniyamāḥ paryuṣṇanādayaḥ prāṇāhutyantā bhoktṛṇām atrāpi santi*. See further Laghvaśvalāyana 23, 65. Apparently all bhojanas came to be connected with the prāṇāhutis. It is, however, conceivable that the eating brahmins not always recite the prāṇāhuti formulas themselves as they are engaged in a sacrifice on behalf of a sacrificer, who at least in some śrāddhā recites the formulas *prāṇe niviṣṭo* . . etc. The inclusion of the prāṇāhuti (*prāṇāya svāhā* . . etc., recited by all the brahmins separately) would imply five sacrifices for the benefit of the five brahmins. The author of the *Smṛticandrikā* tries to adapt the statement that the brahmins should start eating directly after the *āpoṣana* to his view that the prāṇāhuti has to be performed: *juṣadhvam iti te coktās saṃyagvidhṛtabhājānāḥ kṛtamaunās samaśniyur āpoṣanād anantaram|| iti vyāsenoktam| āpoṣanād anantaram amṛtopastaraṇam aṣṭi mantreṇāpaḥ pītva tad anantaram ity arthaḥ| prāṇāhuta ya s tv āśanakriyāyām anupraviṣṭā iti tāsām karaṇe 'pi samaśniyur āpoṣanād anantaram ity aṣya na kaścid virodhaḥ*.

6 Note that as alternative formulas the prāṇāhutis are mentioned, that

śivo mā viśāpradāhāya does not seem to be suitable in the śrāddha context, where the sacrificer does not offer into himself, and that *brahmaṇe svāhā* as a sixth āhuti after the prāṇāhutis occurs in some late texts (see also Kane, *Hist. of Dharmaś.* II, p. 764 n. 1829).

7 For the omission of this formula, which even in the prāṇagnihotra context is difficult to explain, see n. 6. The prāṇāhutis are perhaps missing because the sacrificer here does not offer to his own *prāṇāḥ*.

8 From *amṛtopastaraṇam aṣṭi* to *amṛtāpidhānam aṣṭi*.

9 The version of TĀ. 10, 33 (*Bibl. Ind.* ed.), however, includes the formulas *prāṇāya svāhā* . . etc.

10 As is assumed by Sāyaṇa's commentary on TĀ. 10, 34. It should, however, be admitted that in the TĀ. version, where *amṛtopastaraṇam aṣṭi* and *amṛtāpidhānam aṣṭi* enclose the ordinary prāṇagnihotra mantras as well as those without *śivo mā viśāpradāhāya*, the arrangement of the mantras speaks in favour of this view.

11 The framework of the MNU. mantrapāṭha relates to the daily rites and this śrāddha bhojana does not take place every day, but some incidental ceremonies are included in this mantrapāṭha. MNU. 387 ff. e.g. deals with "strophes destinées à préserver le récitant de la mort" (Varenne, o.c. II, p. 39). This hardly fits in Varenne's interpretation of MNU. as a "Bréviaire du Renonçant" (o.c., p. 43) no saṃnyāsin or hermit caring for the prolongation of life. Varenne's explanation that death should be taken here as the opposite of eternal life or amṛta (o.c. I, p. 93) is more ingenious than convincing. Actually these mantras are used in a rite. See ĀgnGS. 2, 5, 4 (*athāto 'pamṛtyuñjīyakalpaṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ*). Most of the mantras from MNU. 387-413 are used in this rite and we may therefore assume that MNU. forms the mantrapāṭha of (one version of) this ceremony.

12 They are often explicitly called āhavanīyas in (the formulas of) the śrāddha ritual. See e.g. *Smṛtic.*, *Śrāddhakāṇḍa*, p. 345.

13 Two brahmins represent the Viśve Devas.

14 According to Caland, *Ahnencult*, p. 187 f. this mantra implies that the sacrificer "sich . . die erde als die schüssel denkt, worüber der himmel gleichsam der deckel ist. Ursprünglich wurde also der spruch dort gebraucht, wo die speise auf der erde, nicht in einer schüssel dargeboten wurde". The cosmic aspect seems to be more essential. The food for the brahmins represents all *annam* of this cosmos, which is offered to or in brahman.

15 Caland, *Ahnencult*, p. 30 translates *brahmaṇas tvā mukhe juhomi* "im munde eines brāhmaṇa opfere ich dich", but the occurrence of the term *brāhmaṇa* in the same context (*brāhmaṇānām tvā . . prāṇāpānāyor juhomi*) indicates that *brahman* should not be taken as brahmin. The brahmins represent brahman. That later texts have *brāhmaṇas* for *brahmaṇas* in this mantra does not prove much.

16 How should the sacrificer enter into his own *prāṇāḥ*, which are moreover the object of his sacrifice (*prāṇāya svāhā* . . etc.) and perhaps even the fires?

17 One may assume that *śrāddhāyām* was present in the original śrāddha version.

18 By entering into brahman's *prāṇāḥ* (the five brahmins)? Or is the oblation as usual identified with the sacrificer?

19 The prāṇāhutis are old and occur in the śrauta ritual with oblations in the sacred fire(s). In connection with the offering into oneself (the prāṇagnihotra) they are already found in ChU. The formulas (*śrāddhāyām*) *prāṇe niviṣṭo* . . etc. do not appear in prāṇagnihotra contexts before BDhS. (later

than BGS.) and the undoubtedly late tenth book of TĀ. (= MNU.).
²⁰ I.e. (*om*) *prāṇāya svāhā* etc. See Kane, *Hist. of Dharmaś.* II, p. 733, n. 1747. Sometimes one consumes the food oneself, but often it is given to others. Moreover the formulas are recited during the offering to the deity, who is supposed to eat at that moment. The actual eating takes place later. BGParS. 2, 18 prescribes the formulas *amytopastaraṇam asi* and *amytāpi-dhānam asi* before and after the *naivedya* (Mahādevapūjā), but does not have the *prāṇāhuti*. See further for the Tantric *pūjā* Tārābhaktisudhārṇava (*Tantrik Texts* XXI, 1940), p. 212 f. and MahāNT. 6, 92 (with comm. *prāṇāya svāhā . . iti mantrair . . devīm haviḥ prāśayet bhojayet*). The *prāṇāgni*hotra is sometimes regarded as one of the *pūjās* (and not as the *naivedya* part of a *pūjā*). See Vṛddha-HārītaSm. 8, 91: the *pūjā* may be performed *apsu*, *agnau*, *hṛdaye*, *sūrye*, *sthaṇḍile*, *pratimāsu*. Here *hṛdaye* refers to the *prāṇāgni*hotra (8, 98: *agnihotrasamaye*; 8, 106: *juhuyāt pañca prāṇān*). See also Ch. XI. For the *naivedya* *prāṇāhuti* compare *The Cultural Heritage* IV, p. 462. See also Gonda, *Viṣṇuism and Śivaism* (London 1970), p. 191, n. 309 (not convincing in all respects).

CHAPTER NINE

UPANIṢADIC PASSAGES WHICH RIGHTLY OR WRONGLY HAVE BEEN CONNECTED WITH THE PRĀṆAGNIHOTRA

A. The *antaram agnihotram* of ŚāṅkhĀ. 10 and parallels

Varenne¹ mentions as texts which deal with the *prāṇāgni*hotra apart from ChMP., MNU., BDhŚ., VaiSmS. and PrāṇU. (which have been treated above in ch. VIII) also KauṣU., ŚāṅkhĀ., BĀU. and ChU. As for the KauṣU. passage (2, 5) we have seen² that this *antaram agnihotram* has no relation to the sacrifice in and to the breaths. Speech and breath are offered into each other and there is no reference to the eating of food. The *antaram agnihotram* of ŚāṅkhĀ. 10, however, may indeed be connected with the *prāṇāgni*hotra, either as a starting-point or as a reflection of that rite. Parallels of this passage are GB. 1, 3, 14 and ChU. 5, 19 ff. References to the ritual are very limited; only the ChU. version explicitly mentions five offerings and five formulas (*prāṇāya svāhā* etc.). The general concept is that by eating one satisfies the *prāṇāḥ* (vital powers), which in their turn satisfy the corresponding deities and parts of the cosmos. On account of micro-macrocosmic identifications the *prāṇāhuti* is interpreted as a *tarpaṇam* of the whole cosmos. After quoting the upaniṣad of the first offering I shall give a comparative scheme of the classificatory system in the three versions: GB. *yo ha vā evaṃ vidvān aśnāti ca pibati ca vāk tena trpyati vāci trptāyām agnis trpyaty agnau trpte prthivī trpyati prthivyām trptāyām yāni prthivyām bhūtāny anvāyattāni tāni trpyanti*; ŚāṅkhĀ. (the deities agni, vāyu, etc. are established in the vital powers *vāk*, *prāṇa* etc.) *etāsu ha vai sarvāṣu hutam bhavati ya evaṃ vidvān aśnāti ca pibati cāśayati ca pāyayati ca so 'śnāti sa pibati sa trpyati sa tarpayati sa trpto vācam tarpayati vāk trptāgnim tarpayaty agnis trptaḥ prthivīm tarpayati prthivī trptā yat kim ca prthivyā apihitam bhavad bhaviṣyad bhūtam tat sarvaṃ tarpayati ya evaṃ vidvān aśnāti ca pibati cāśayati ca pāyayati ca*; ChU. *tad yad bhaktam prathamam āgacchet tad dhomīyam sa yām prathamām āhutiṃ juhuyāt tām juhuyāt prāṇāya svāheti prāṇas trpyati prāṇe trpyati cakṣus trpyati cakṣuṣi trpyaty ādityas trpyaty āditye trpyati dyaus trpyati divi trpyantyaṃ yat kim ca dyaus*

*cādityaś cādhitīṣṭhatas tat tṛpyati tasyānu tṛptim tṛpyati prajayā paśubhir annādyena tejasā brahmavarcasena.*³

GB/ŚāṅkhĀ	ChU	GB/ŚāṅkhĀ	GB	ŚāṅkhĀ	ChU
<i>vāc</i>	3	<i>agni</i> (= ChU)	<i>prthivī</i>	= GB	= GB
<i>prāṇa</i>	..	<i>vāyu</i> (= ChU)	<i>antarikṣam</i>	<i>ākāśa</i>	<i>ākāśa</i>
<i>caṅkṣus</i>	1	<i>āditya</i> (= ChU)	<i>dyaus</i>	= GB	= GB
<i>manas</i>	4	<i>candramas</i> (ChU <i>parjanya</i>)	<i>āpah</i>	<i>saṃvat-</i> <i>sara</i>	<i>vidyut</i>
<i>śrotram</i>	2	<i>diśaḥ</i> (ChU <i>candramas</i>)	<i>antardeśāḥ</i>	<i>āvāntara-</i> <i>diśaḥ</i>	<i>diśaḥ</i>
<i>retas</i> ⁴		<i>āpah</i>		<i>samudram</i>	

The close relationship between the three passages is evident. ŚāṅkhĀ. agrees with GB. in many respects. Both passages do not include the breaths in their identifications. ChU., starting from the breaths (*prāṇa*, *vyāna*, *apāna*, *samāna*, *udāna*), meets with difficulties in combining these *prāṇāḥ* with the other series of *prāṇāḥ* (the vital powers) and therefore leaves out *prāṇa* as (the fifth) vital function. Now *udāna* is directly connected with *vāyu*, whereas obviously only *prāṇa* could make this connection.⁵ The whole system of equations in this agnihotra theory has no relation to the breaths. The ChU. version is obviously secondary. This also appears from the different order in ChU., where the usual series *agni*, *vāyu*, *āditya*, *candramas* / earth, *antarikṣam*, heaven, waters, has been broken up. The version of ŚāṅkhĀ. completely excludes the connection with the five breaths (and the *prāṇāhuti* with the formulas *prāṇāya svāhā* etc.) by adding *retas* as the sixth vital function.

The basic concept of this agnihotra in GB., ŚāṅkhĀ. and ChU. (which not wholly successfully tries to combine this concept with the *prāṇāhuti*) is that the offering of food in oneself is to maintain and strengthen the sacrificer's life (*prāṇāḥ* as the vital powers). So far this concept does not differ materially from the usual speculations on the agnihotra in connection with the identification of fires and *prāṇāḥ*. New is the cosmic dimension produced by homologizing the vital powers with their divine and cosmic equivalents. The sacri-

fice in and to man becomes a sacrifice to the Puruṣa, the cosmos. The maintenance of the world's life has no relation with the ordinary *adhidaivam* interpretation of the agnihotra (sunset, sunrise, night and day, Time), but is evidently based on the *adhyātmam* approach, which refers more to maintaining life than to the aspect of alternation (evening/daybreak). Now these homologies of vital functions with cosmic entities are not quite new and the GB. passage perhaps simply has to be taken as the *adhidaivam* interpretation of a (prāṇāgnihotra) rite⁶ which itself is already the *adhyātmam* version of another sacrifice (the agnihotra). Similarly ŚāṅkhĀ. does not connect any doctrine with these identifications. The idea of a sacrifice to the Puruṣa may be implied, but is not worked out. It is only in ChU. that this *ātmayajña* is placed in the context of the Ātman Vaiśvānara theory (5, 24, 4). Aśvapati Kaikeya concludes his discussion with six brahmins who interpret this Ātman as heaven, sun, etc., with the statement that they eat food (i.e. live) only knowing a partial aspect of the Ātman Vaiśvānara and therefore live as individuals without realizing the unity of all ātmans in the cosmic Ātman. The right knowledge of the Ātman Vaiśvānara implies that one eats food in all worlds, all beings and all ātmans. If knowing thus, one offers the agnihotra (i.e. the prāṇāgnihotra, performed by eating food) *tasya sarveṣu lokeṣu sarveṣu bhūteṣu sarveṣu ātmasu hutam bhavati* (5, 24, 2). Even giving the remains to a *caṇḍāla* means offering in the Ātman Vaiśvānara (5, 24, 4). So here ātman-brahman speculations have been connected with the prāṇāgnihotra. The *ātmayajña* becomes an Ātmayajña, a sacrifice to the universal Ātman. The brahmin is not the exclusive representative of brahman or Agni (Ātman) Vaiśvānara forming the substitute of the sacrificial fire, but every ātman is the same and identical with the Ātman Vaiśvānara and as such may receive the offering to that highest principle. The conclusion of the GB. and ŚāṅkhĀ. passages is entirely different. GB. only observes that the hands and the throat are the *juhū*, *upabhṛt* and *dhruvā* (sacrificial implements), food forms the oblation and the *prāṇāḥ* (presumably the breaths and not the vital powers) are the fires (*jyotiṃsi*). ŚāṅkhĀ., speaking of a tenfold agnihotra, has the following equations: *prāṇa*, *apāna* and *vyāna* are identical with the three fires, mind with smoke, passion (*manu*) with the flame (*arcis*), teeth with the coals, *śraddhā*, *vāc* and *satyam* with milk, fuel and oblation, *prajñātman* with the *rasa*, the essence of the rite. The inclusion of *śraddhā* and *satyam* as the material for the obla-

tion and the oblation itself is evidently out of place in this *ātmayajña* which is performed by eating food.⁷ Varenne's note (o.c., p. 90, n. 8) on *etad vairājam daśavidham agnihotram bhavati*: "La Virāj est la Vache resplendissante qui représente le principe origine (*brāhman*) ; ici, c'est dire que l'Oblation interne relève du *brāhman* aussi bien que de l'*ātman*" is too much a reinterpretation of the passage which is based on the ChU. parallel. I doubt whether the author intended to express with the *virāj* symbolism the same ideas as are found in the context of the ChU. *prāṇāgnihotra*. There is a tendency to make every rite corresponding to the tenfold *virāj*⁸ through symbolism by numbers. Moreover this tenfold *vairājam agnihotram* with the oblation consisting of *satyam* obviously represents a secondary addition to the original passage with the oblation of food.

In the conclusion of the ŚāṅkhĀ. passage the sentences *taḍ etad vairājam daśavidham agnihotram bhavati rohābhyām rohābhyām abhyāruḥam abhi svargam lokam gamayati ya evaṁ vidvān aśnāti ca pibati cāśayati ca pāyayati ca* form a problem. Keith renders: "That Virāj-like, tenfold Agnihotra is offered. Him it sends to the world of heaven, which is mounted by these two ascents, who knowing this eats and drinks and makes to eat and drink". According to Varenne (o.c., p. 90, n. 8) "les deux montées sont les deux chemins du sacrifice". His reference to ChU. 5, 10 implies that he regards these two ascents as the *pīṭyāna* and *devayāna* (which for that matter are the paths of the deceased rather than the paths of the sacrifice). Keith (ŚāṅkhĀ. transl., p. 60, n. 1) observes: "i.e. the real and the antara Agnihotra". Now the repetition of *rohābhyām* clearly has a distributive, frequentative force. This already excludes Varenne's interpretation and probably also Keith's. I take the dual as referring to the two daily performances of the agnihotra (or the *prāṇāgnihotra*). The repetition has a frequentative force and refers to the ever returning daily performance of the rite. Every agnihotra performance takes the sacrificer to heaven, an idea which is not alien to the older conceptions of the agnihotra which teach that the oblation (which is often identical with the sacrificer) is offered in heaven (the *āhavanīya*). Here again the relation to the food-eating agnihotra remains obscure; nor is there any connection with the *daśavidham agnihotram* in which *satyam* forms the oblation. In my opinion several disconnected approaches of the agnihotra have been brought together in this *antaram agnihotram* of ŚāṅkhĀ.

I shall summarize my conclusions on the three versions as follows:

a) The most original version is found in GB., where, however, it forms a secondary addition to an esoteric ŚB. passage on agnihotra expiations;⁹ b) ŚāṅkhĀ. is based on the GB. version or on its source, but has made some additions; c) as for the contents (especially of the context) the ChU. version seems to be the most advanced; there are some parallels to ŚāṅkhĀ.,¹⁰ but in view of other ŚāṅkhĀ. passages which are evidently based on ChU.,¹¹ borrowing from ŚāṅkhĀ. is not likely; d) clear traces of the *prāṇāgnihotra* ritual are lacking in GB. and ŚāṅkhĀ.;¹² e) this food-eating agnihotra conserves or maintains man and the cosmos and has no relation to the concept of the "productive agnihotra"; f) the ChU. passage combines three subjects: 1) the Ātman Vaiśvānara theory;¹³ 2) the *adhyātmam-adhidaivam* classification of GB. or its source (in which the *tarpaṇam* of the vital powers implies the *tarpaṇam* of their cosmic equivalents); 3) the *prāṇāhuti* (referring to the actual rite of the *prāṇāgnihotra*, in which the breaths and not the vital powers are essential, as also appears from the *prāṇāhuti* formulas).

B. The contest of the *prāṇāh* (ChU. 5, 1-2; BĀU. 6, 1)

Undoubtedly Varenne (o.c., p. 70) is right in taking ChU. 5, 11-24 as "réflexions upaniṣadiques" on the *prāṇāgnihotra*. He similarly considers ChU. 5, 1-2 and BĀU. 6, 1 ("la doctrine célèbre de la prééminence des souffles") to be based on this rite, and he concludes (o.c., p. 70); "Une vue claire de tout ceci a l'avantage de faire apparaître la logique interne, par exemple de BĀU. 6, 1, et 2, contrairement à ce qui est parfois suggéré (ainsi, Senart Introd. à la B.Ā.U. chez Budé, p. XXVI)", i.e. even the *pañcāgnividyā* passage should, together with the contest of the *prāṇāh*, belong to a well-arranged unity of upaniṣadic speculations on the *prāṇāgnihotra*. I have some serious doubts about this. For the *pañcāgnividyā* see ch. VI (D). As to the contest of the *prāṇāh* first one may observe that it is also found outside (*prāṇa*-)agnihotra contexts.¹⁴ Its aim generally is the explanation of the use of the plural *prāṇāh* for denoting all the vital powers, and the glorification of the *prāṇa*.¹⁵ Its occurrence in other contexts does not rule out the possibility that it has been adapted to the *prāṇāgnihotra* passage here. Let us therefore examine the contextual framework of the contest which particularly seems to have inspired Varenne's views.

BĀU. 6, 1, 1-13 and ChU. 5, 1, 1-12, after mentioning the special

qualities of the vital powers (the *prāṇa* is *jyeṣṭha* and *śreṣṭha* and he who knows this becomes *jyeṣṭha* and *śreṣṭha* ... etc.), describe the contest, at the end of which the defeated vital powers acknowledge the superiority of the *prāṇa* and transfer their own special qualities, which were mentioned in the introductory passage, to their new chief. In BĀU. this surrendering is preceded by the *prāṇa*'s question or order *tasyo me baliṃ kuruta* (6, 1, 13). Varenne (o.c., p. 72), observing that BĀU. and ChU. do not describe the *prāṇāgni*hotra ritual, but only the "corrélations" which are based on it, expresses the opinion that in doing so these texts nevertheless had to refer to the essential elements of the rite and that therefore we read "qu'il s'agit d'une offrande rituelle (*baliṃ kṛ-*, B.Ā.U. 6, 1, 13) dédiée aux Souffles vitaux (B.Ā.U. 6, 1, 13 ...¹⁶)". First I do not see how presenting a *bali* by the *prāṇāḥ* (to one of them) should be connected with the sacrifice to or in the breaths. Moreover *baliṃ kṛ-* refers to throwing down food for all sorts of powers, demons, gods, rather than to pouring out or offering an *āhuti*. It is also the tribute given by the weaker party to the stronger (ŚB. 11, 2, 6, 14) and here may even be interpreted as the tribute given by the defeated competitors in the struggle for *ādhipatyā* (i.e. the other *prāṇāḥ*) to the victorious king (*prāṇa*) as a token of surrender. It is striking that the vital powers transfer their own special qualities as a *bali* to the *prāṇa*. So the connection with the *prāṇāgni*hotra seems to be far-fetched. The *prāṇa* also asks what will be its food and dress (BĀU. 6, 1, 14; ChU. 5, 2, 1 f.) and the answer is that all which exists up to dogs, birds, insects, ants, etc. will be its food and water (or the waters: *āpah*) its dress. With regard to the latter the texts state: *tad vidvāṃsaḥ śrotṛiṃśāśiṣyanta ācāmanty āsitvācāmanty etam eva tad anam anagnaṃ kurvanto manyante* (BĀU.); *tasmād vā etad āśiṣyantaḥ purastāt copariṣṭāt cādbhiḥ paridadhāti lambhuko ha vāso bhavaty anagno ha bhavati* (ChU.). Here again Varenne¹⁷ assumes a reference to the *prāṇāgni*hotra and now on better grounds. Compare the *prāṇāgni*hōtrā passage MaiU. 6, 9 *adbhiḥ purastāt paridadhāti* (..) *ato 'dbhir bhūya evopariṣṭāt paridadhāti*. This sipping of water before and after the meal (the *āpośāna*) may, however, already have been customary before the rise of the *prāṇāgni*hotra¹⁸ and even if a reference to this rite (apparently to be taken as an ordinary *bhojana* of *śrotṛiṃśa* brahmins) should be assumed here, I doubt if this constitutes the main point of this passage (in which the contest of the *prāṇāḥ* would not have any significant function).

There are several problems contained in these sentences. One may e.g. ask why the covering of the food means that the *prāṇa* has become *anagna* since the *prāṇa* itself is not clothed. And what is the meaning of the conclusion drawn from the statement that everything up to unclean animals such as e.g. dogs forms the food of the *prāṇa*? Does *na ha vā asyānannaṃ jagdhaṃ bhavati nānannaṃ pratigṛhītaṃ ya evam etad anasyānnaṃ veda* (BĀU.) / *na ha vā evamvidi kiṃ canānannaṃ bhavati* (ChU.) imply "eine Aufhebung der Speiseverbote"?¹⁹ Varenne again assumes a connection with the *prāṇāgni*hotra: "... celui qui sait ainsi et pratique ce rite peut manger (donc offrir en libation) n'importe quoi (B.Ā.U. 6, 1, 14; Chānd-Up. 5, 19, 1)" (o.c., p. 72). The reference to ChU. is indeed correct: *tad yad bhaktaṃ prathamam āgacchet tad dhomīyam*, i.e. instead of milk or other special material for the *agni*hotra oblation every kind of ordinary food forms a suitable oblation in the *prāṇāgni*hotra. Because the *prāṇāgni*hotra is a *bhojanam*, all food is suitable as an "oblation". This does not imply that everything on earth is suitable food for the daily *bhojanam*. In BĀU. 6, 1, 14, however, no reference to oblatory material is found, but a general statement on eating and accepting impure food (*nānannaṃ pratigṛhītaṃ*) is made as a secondary conclusion to the *prāṇa*'s eating of everything up to dogs etc. One should distinguish between the food of the *prāṇa* in the myth and the food eaten by man. The mythical *prāṇāḥ* which were involved in this contest for supremacy are not situated in a human being, but in a cosmic *Puruṣa*. The *prāṇa* which becomes superior to the others is therefore the cosmic *Prāṇa*,²⁰ the highest god, *Vāyu*, the sun, *Prajāpati*, etc. The food of this cosmic *Prāṇa* consists of all living beings up to the lowest. The *Prāṇa* subsists on the *prāṇa* (= life) of all beings, on all *prāṇināḥ*. In this myth *annam* is not to be taken literally (as the food of man or animals) and consequently I reject Deussen's translation "Alles, was hier vorhanden ist, bis herab zu [dem was] den Hunden und Vögeln [als Nahrung dient]",²¹ which requires too many ingenious ellipses and brackets. For the conception of the *Prāṇa* pervading the whole animate world up to the lowest beings compare AĀ. 2, 1, 6 ... *tad yathāyam ākāśaḥ prāṇena brhatyā viṣṭabdhā evaṃ sarvāṇi bhūtāny ā pipīlikābhyah prāṇena brhatyā viṣṭabdhāni*.²² For the cosmic *Prāṇa* as the eater and all beings as the food see MaiU. 6, 2 *atha ya eṣo 'ntare hṛtṣuṣkara evāśrito 'nnam atti sa eṣo 'gnir divi śṛitaḥ saurāḥ kālākhyo 'dṛśyaḥ sarvabhūtāny annam atti* "This (self called *Prāṇa*) ... is the same as the fire which,

reposing in heaven, . . . eats all beings as its food" (tr. van Buitenen, p. 39). Compare MaiU. 7, 7 (see n. 20) and perhaps PrU. 2, 4, where Prāṇa is called the *attā* for whom we (i.e. the *prāṇinah*) are the givers of food (*vayam ādyasya dātārah*; i.e. we are his food?), and further JUB. 3, 1, 2, 4 *mahāntam asya mahimānam āhur anādyamāno yad adantam atti*, where the wind or the cosmic Prāṇa is regarded as the eater of the individual *prāṇa* (or *prāṇin*).²³ This "eating" apparently means that the Prāṇa receives the *prāṇa* of the deceased *prāṇins*. In this function Prāṇa is equal to the sun (or other highest gods or principles) and should be localized in heaven within the immortal waters.²⁴ As such it may be called *apo vasānah* or something like that.²⁵ The question "What will be my dress (*vāsas*)?" may refer to such a qualification. The praise of the one, cosmic Prāṇa is a central theme in this passage;²⁶ the conclusions on the sipping of water before and after the meal and the fact that no food is *ananna* are secondary. It is hardly conceivable that the long passage on the contest of the *prāṇāḥ*, which ends with the supremacy of the Prāṇa, should only have been included in the text to explain why water is sipped at the beginning and end of a *prāṇāgnihotra* rite in which this special position of the Prāṇa does not play a role at all.

The conclusions drawn from the myth have no connection with the theme of the passage: the contest and the superiority of one of the *prāṇāḥ*. They refer to the universal role of life (*prāṇa*) and food (*annam*), to the current *annam-prāṇa* theories, which teach that the vital elements of every existence, i.e. life and food, are interdependent and ultimately identical,²⁷ in the context of the Prāṇa's glorification which often follows on the contest passages. We have noticed above that sipping water before and after the meal as a clothing of the *prāṇa* forms a problem, food in fact being "clothed". The only explanation to be given is that food is identical with *prāṇa* (i.e. the omnipresence of the Prāṇa of the myth in the whole cosmos). This identity is indeed expressed in the text by means of a "pseudo-etymology", viz. *tad vā etad anasyānnam ano ha vai prāṇasya nāma pratyakṣam* (ChU. 5, 2, 1), *ya evam etad anasyānnam veda* (BĀU. 6, 1, 14).²⁸ If the conclusions that may be drawn from the statement that all living beings are the Prāṇa's food and the water its dress, are not the primary goal of this passage on the contest of the *prāṇāḥ*, one may ask why the Prāṇa inquires about the food and the clothes. These two things, indeed, form the primary needs of human beings,

but the Prāṇa is not just an ordinary human being, it is the one which has triumphed in the contest of the *prāṇāḥ* and has claimed as a victorious (new) king a *bali* from his defeated opponents. Perhaps this image of the Prāṇa as a king is sustained and the food for which he asks are his subjects. The king as *attā* and his people as *annam* were a current concept in Ancient India.²⁹ The Prāṇa reigns as a universal king over all living beings. The garment may be the symbol of his royalty.³⁰ We shall see below that this interpretation of the contest passage does not conflict with the (at least in the ChU. version) immediately following subject in the context, the rite of the mixed potion (*mantha*).

C. *The ceremony of the mixed potion (mantha): ChU. 5, 2, 4 ff. and BĀU. 6, 3, and its relation to the contest of the prāṇāḥ*

In ChU. the contest is followed (after the insertion 5, 2, 3³¹) by a magic rite for obtaining greatness (*atha yadi mahaj jīgamiṣet . . .*), in which a mixed potion is prepared, butter is poured out five times in the fire with the formulas *jyēsthāya śreṣṭhāya svāhā, vasiṣṭhāya svāhā*, etc. (cf. ChU. 5, 1, 1 ff. . . . *prāṇo vāva jyēsthā ca śreṣṭhā ca . . . vāg vāva vasiṣṭhā . . .* etc.) and the rest of the libation is poured into the mixed potion every time. So one offers to the five *prāṇāḥ* and ChU. 5, 1, 1-5 and this passage (5, 2, 4 ff.) form a unity. In the BĀU. version the *pañcāgnividyā* has been inserted between this magic rite (6, 3) and the description of the qualities of the *prāṇāḥ* (and their contest) (6, 1). This rite, though dealing with offerings to the five *prāṇāḥ* (in the fire), has no relation to the *prāṇāgnihotra*, as it is not performed daily and its aims are totally different.³² In the parallel version of ŚāṅkhĀ., which is based on ChU., the myth of the contest is similarly followed directly by this *mantha* ceremony.³³

For a parallel combination of a myth on the *prāṇāḥ* with a magic rite one may compare ŚāṅkhĀ. 11. First is described how Prajāpati makes the deities Agni, Vāyu (..) and brahman enter into the *puruṣa*'s speech, breath (..) and ātman. The deities leave the *puruṣa* and are forced by Prajāpati to enter again. This passage ends with *sa yathā mahān vṛkṣa ārdra upasikṭamūlas tiṣṭhed evaṃ haiva sa tasthau* (11, 2), i.e. the *puruṣa* who had been withering by the departure of the deities is now again like a watered tree.³⁴ The same eleventh adhyāya mentions (after the description of bad visions, the presages of death) a magic rite for people who want to evade death.

Milk is cooked (cf. the *mantha*), butter is offered with the formulas *vāci me 'gniḥ pratiṣṭhitāḥ svāhā prāṇe me vāyuh* (...) *ātmani me brahma pratiṣṭhitam svāhā* (cf. the introductory Prajāpati myth) and the rest of the butter is poured into the milk (II, 5; cf. the *mantha* ceremony). Then one offers this milk mixed with the remains of the butter reciting the formulas *vāci me 'gniḥ pratiṣṭhito vāg hrdaye hrdayam ātmani tat satyaṃ devānāṃ māham akāmo mariṣyāmy³⁵ annavān annādo bhūyāsam svāhā* . . etc. and drinks the rest of the oblation oneself: *athaitat sthālīpākaśeṣam ātmani samavaniniya juhoti* (compare the *mantha* rite, where also the performer drinks the fluid into which the rests of the butter libations had been poured). The performer of this rite now becomes like the *puruṣa* in the myth; he is as it were a watered, fresh tree and will not die. Note how the myth on the *prāṇāḥ* and the deities forms the introduction to the magic rite and how (mythical) speculations on the *prāṇāḥ* are applied to practical purposes in this āraṇyaka text.³⁶

If in the same way we now try to connect the contest of the *prāṇāḥ* with the *mantha* ceremony, the central theme we must search for in that rite is the idea of superiority (*prāṇa* being *jyeṣṭha* and *śreṣṭha* and victorious in the contest) and perhaps also of universal kingship (the *prāṇāḥ* vassals give tribute to the *adhipati* king *Prāṇa*, who rules over all living beings as his *annam*). In the abridged version of ŚāṅkhĀ. 9 there are no clear references to this idea. The aim of the rite, viz. the wish to obtain *mahat*, may, of course, be connected with the contest and the reaching of supremacy.³⁷ In the ChU. and BĀU. versions, however, a (corrupt) verse is found which clearly expresses the relation with the contest of the *prāṇāḥ* and *Prāṇa*'s position as a great king: *amo nāmāsy amā hi te sarvam idam / sa hi jyeṣṭhaḥ śreṣṭho rājādhipatiḥ / sa mā jyaiṣṭhyam śraiṣṭhyam rājyam / ādhipatyam gamayatu / (aham evedam sarvam asāni)* (ChU. 5, 2, 6); *āmāmsy āmāṃ hi te mahi / sa hi rājeśāno 'dhipatiḥ / sa māṃ rājeśāno 'dhipatiṃ karotu* (BĀU. 6, 3, 5).³⁸ So the performer of the magic rite tries to obtain the same *ādhipatyam* as was reached by *Prāṇa* in the contest of the *prāṇāḥ*. The relation between the myth and the magic rite is the same as found in ŚāṅkhĀ. 11 (the magic rite for averting death; see above). Deussen's explanation (*Sechzig Upanishad's*, p. 132) "Der Sinn der Zeremonie scheint ursprünglich darin zu liegen, dass man (durch Trinken des Restes der den Lebensorganen gespendeten Butter) die eignen Lebensorgane in Beziehung setzt zu den als kosmische Po-

tenzen gedachten Lebensorganen und dadurch an deren Grösse teilnimmt" is a misinterpretation due to his false assumption that the contest passage is inserted ("weil den Zusammenhang unterbrechend"). To what extent this *ādhipatyam* has to be taken literally is difficult to decide.³⁹ Anyhow ChU. 5, 1-2 forms a unity and deals with the *mantha* rite. There is no essential connection with the *prāṇāgni*hotra in the contest of the *prāṇāḥ*. The parallel ŚāṅkhĀ. 11 agrees with ChU. The version of BĀU. has inserted the *pañcāgnividyā*, which in ChU. comes after the *mantha* and is omitted in ŚāṅkhĀ.⁴⁰ This *pañcāgnividyā* is entirely independent from the other passages in the context and has also been proved to refer in no way to the *prāṇāgni*hotra (see ch. VI D). So Varenne (o.c., p. 69 ff.) is wrong in taking the whole fifth *prapāṭhaka* of ChU. and BĀU. 6, 1-2 (apparently 6, 3, which deals with the BĀU. version of the *mantha*, is left out of account) as "reflexions upaniṣadiques (...) sur un rite secret" (p. 70), as dealing with "une doctrine du *prāṇāgni*hotra" (p. 72). One should bear in mind that several disconnected passages have been brought together in these upaniṣads and that especially BĀU. 6 (just as KauṣU. 2 and the last books of ŚāṅkhĀ.) consists of a collection of magic rites from the sphere of the AV. and the *grhya* ritual mixed with more speculative material. The connecting pattern seems to be *prāṇa* and the *prāṇāḥ*. These texts do not contain vague reflections on secret rites. The rites are clearly described and sometimes a mythical foundation of the rite precedes. A vague relationship between the *prāṇāgni*hotra passage (where the sacrificer is identified with the whole cosmos) and the *mantha* ceremony (where ultimately one also offers the oblation into oneself and wishes *aham evedam sarvam asāni*) may be assumed.

D. MaiU. and the *prāṇāgni*hotra

Van Buitenen⁴¹ regards the *prāṇāgni*hotra passage MaiU. 6, 9 as an interpolation, but admits in a note on the identification of *ātman* and *prāṇa* in I, 1⁴² that "the intention of the text is the *prāṇāgni*hotra". On the other hand the actual *agni*hotra plays a role in this upaniṣad. The relation between the two rituals (or, rather, the speculations belonging to them) remains rather obscure in van Buitenen's "Evaluation of the Original Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad",⁴³ where the term *prāṇāgni*hotra is not even used at all and the whole doctrine of this upaniṣad seems to be considered as "expressed

in the context of the *agnihotra* and related rites" (p. 71). The *prāṇāgnihotra*, apparently, is not meant as one of the "related rites".⁴⁴ On account of these obscurities it may be useful to examine once again the ritualistic background of this text.

The *agnicayana* is mentioned MaiU. 1, 1 (*brahmayaājño vā eṣa yat pūrveṣāṃ cayanam / tasmād yajamānaś citvaitān agnīn ātmānam abhidhyāyet*) and more elaborately treated at MaiU. 6, 33. In his reconstruction of the original text van Buitenen has convincingly shown that the ch. 1-5 have been added later and that 1, 1 and 6, 33 ff. belong together.⁴⁵ Now the problem is whether 6, 1 ff. form a unity with 6, 33 ff. According to van Buitenen (p. 35) the nucleus of 6, 1 ff. (i.e. without insertions and additions) should indeed be connected to 6, 33 ff.: "The theme of 6, 33 ff. is the *agnihotra* and connected rites, and the theme of 6, 1 ff. is essentially the same. The same triple homology of Sun, Prāṇa/Heart/Eye, and Fire, which is the basis of 6, 33 ff. appears in the earlier nuclear context of the same chapter (...) On the whole one could say that 6, 1 ff. form the speculative preamble to the more concrete ritual applications of 6, 33 ff." This threefold homology mentioned, however, is found only once before 6, 33⁴⁶ and references to fires are well-nigh missing in 6, 1 ff. The basic theme are the identification of *prāṇa* and *āditya* and speculations on food. MaiU. 6, 18-32 (dealing with yoga etc.) do not seem to belong to the original text. There is no trace of the actual *agnihotra* (not even in the form of a "speculative preamble") and all the data point rather to the *prāṇāgnihotra* as the subject of 6, 1 ff.

MaiU. 6, 1 starts with *dvidhā vā eṣa ātmānam bibharti / ayaṃ yah prāṇa yaś cāsā ādityah*. Whether the Supreme as subject of this sentence should be interpreted as "Fire" (as is done by van Buitenen⁴⁷), is doubtful. The sacrificial fire, at least, does not play a role here and the homology is twofold and not threefold. The next section (6, 2) again stresses the identity of the *prāṇa* in the heart-lotus which eats food (*prāṇāgnihotra* topic!) and the sun which eats the eater (*sarvabhūtāny annam atti*; it is the cosmic Prāṇa). These speculations have no demonstrable relation to the actual *agnihotra*, but may well be connected with the *prāṇāgnihotra*. The identity of the two manifestations of the Supreme should be meditated upon by means of the *praṇava*, the *vyāhrtis* and the *sāvitrī*, upon which 6, 3-7 comment. According to van Buitenen (p. 39) "the theme of the *agnyādhāna* - *agnihotra* is obvious" in the meditation upon the

microcosmic and macrocosmic *prāṇa* by means of these formulas. Now these formulas are used in many different contexts, but I fail to see any relation to the rituals mentioned. The reference to the *agnyādhāna* seems to be made in order to maintain the connection with 6, 33, which deals with the *agnicayana*, interpreted by van Buitenen as an *agnyādhāna*. The most well-known application of the *sāvitrī* is in the *saṃdhyā* and the *brahmayaājña*,⁴⁸ but in the present MaiU. passage it introduces (together with the *vyāhrtis*) the *prāṇāgnihotra*.⁴⁹ Then follows in 6, 9 the probably interpolated description of the *prāṇāgnihotra* preceded by *tasmād vā ubhayātmaivamvid ātmann evābhidhyāyaty ātmann eva yajati* (retained by van Buitenen). The exact interpretation of this sentence (or sentences) may be problematic,⁵⁰ but it is clear that the text refers to an *ātmayaājña*,⁵¹ presumably the *prāṇāgnihotra*. If I am right, however, van Buitenen connects this passage with the actual *agnihotra*, which for the *evamvid* were to mean an *ātmayaājña*.⁵² Now this concept of the *ātmayaājña* as the esoteric interpretation of an actually performed sacrifice is indeed possible in itself, but hardly fits the present context. Nowhere can one find an unequivocal reference to the *agnihotra*.

After the *prāṇāgnihotra* *bhojanavidhi* (6, 9), which indeed seems to announce itself as a (very suitable) insertion (but *prayogastha* need not be interpreted with van Buitenen as "found in the practice manuals"; it also means "practised", cf. TUBhV. 1, 47), the text continues (6, 10) with a new interpretation of this *ātmayaājña* in terms of Sāṃkhya philosophy. This is undoubtedly an interpolation, but it shows that the *ātmayaājña* should be regarded as the eating of food, i.e. as a *prāṇāgnihotra*. Chapter 6, 11 (retained by van Buitenen) deals again with eating food and maintaining the *prāṇāh* (in both senses): an unmistakable reference to the *prāṇāgnihotra*. Van Buitenen's remark (p. 45 commenting on 6, 11) that the two *ātmans* (the personal and the cosmic) "have yet another correspondent in the sacrificial fire, which receives the oblation" is rather surprising in the light of the fact that no sacrificial fire is mentioned in MaiU. 6, 1-11. Therefore the statement: "The *agnihotra* and accompanying ceremonies symbolize a simultaneous reproduction on three levels of creation: through it the sun, which is the "person" of the creator, is regenerated, the *yajamāna*, which is the creator in microcosm, is nourished, and the sacrificial fire, providing the ritual basis of the reproduction, is fed" may well be made as a commentary on 6, 37 (if "simultaneous" would be dropped), but it is out of place when

referring to 6, 11 and its context. It may be noted here that the prāṇāgnihotra bhojana is not identical with the consuming of the remains of the agnihotra and that consequently the prāṇāgnihotra cannot be taken as an accompanying ceremony of the agnihotra.

The sections 6, 12-14 (introduced with *athānyatrāpy uktam* and not accepted by van Buitenen) contain some further speculations on food. Compare 6, 13 *yāvantīha vai bhūtāny annam adanti tāvatsv antaḥstho 'nnam atti ya haivaṃ veda* to ChU. 5, 18, 1 *yas tv etam eva prādeśamātram ativimānam ātmānam vaiśvānaram upāste sa sarveṣu lokeṣu sarveṣu bhūteṣu sarveṣu ātmasv annam atti* and 5, 24, 2 *atha ya etad evaṃ vidvān agnihotraṃ* (sc. the prāṇāgnihotra) *juhōti tasya sarveṣu lokeṣu sarveṣu bhūteṣu sarveṣu ātmasu hutam bhavati*. After the last "original" section before 6, 33 van Buitenen observes: "After the general theory of the esoteric *agnihotra*, namely the identity of the three "fiery" entities involved therein, the rising sun, the sacrificial fire and the *prāṇa-vaiśvānara*, the ritual practice is now set forth in concrete terms" (p. 48, commenting on 6, 17). In fact, however, the agnihotra was not mentioned or implied at all in the preceding sections, and 6, 33 ff. do not deal exclusively with that rite.

First (6, 33) the *agnicayana* is treated. I doubt if one should interpret (with van Buitenen⁵³) this *cayana* as an *agnyādhāna* (a rite preliminary to the agnihotra in most texts) influenced by the *agnicayana*. The text clearly speaks of layers (*citis*) and bricks. On the other hand the actual piling of the fire does not seem to form the aim of this upaniṣad. It was the symbolism of the fire-altar and the speculations vaguely connected with it (as e.g. found in ŚB.) which interested the author of the text. Similarly the actual agnihotra is hardly treated in 6, 33 ff. The identity of prāṇa (the ātman), the sun (the cosmic ātman) and the fire, three representations of brahman, forms the central theme of these sections. This threefold homology, which in the brāhmaṇa speculations on the agnihotra hardly plays a role, is already found in the *agnicayana* sections of ŚB. Prajāpati (in this upaniṣad replaced by brahman) is identical with the sun, the fire of the fire-altar and the sacrificer. Sometimes this homology is described as the man in the sun, the gold man in the fire-altar and the man in the eye of the sacrificer.⁵⁴ Cf. MaiU. 6, 35 *etad yad ādityasya madhya ivākṣiṇy agnau caitad brahma*. The identification of sun, fire and prāṇa is, however, also found in the *agnirahasyam* of ŚB. According to ŚB. 10, 2, 6, 16 ff. the year, the fire and man (the *adhidevatam*, *adhiyajñam* and *adhyātmam* equivalents) have sun, fire and

prāṇa as their immortal element. The oblation is the fire's food. See also ŚB. 10, 6, 2 dealing with the fire (of the fire-altar), the sun and the prāṇa as the eaters of food. It is remarkable that that passage occurring in the *agnicayana* section (*agnirahasyam*) is preceded by the same discussion on the *Vaiśvānara* (the *agni vaiśvānara*) which in the version of ChU. (5, 11 ff.; this text deals with the *ātman vaiśvānara*) is concluded with the prāṇāgnihotra. Apparently the speculations on the ātman could be connected with the *agnicayana* as well as with the prāṇāgnihotra. The starting-point for the prāṇāgnihotra in the agnihotra speculations was the identification of the fires (mostly three) and the *prāṇāḥ*. The oblation in the prāṇāgnihotra is, however, offered to the *prāṇāḥ* rather than in them. The five *prāṇāḥ* of the prāṇāhutis together came to be regarded as one prāṇa, the ātman. As to the identification of sun and fire it should be observed that in the agnihotra only the āhavanīya is sometimes connected with the sun. The *agnicayana* symbolism, however, deals only with one fire, which is regarded as identical with the sacrificer's self (or prāṇa) as well as with the sun. The prāṇāgnihotra ātmayajña as a sacrifice to the one prāṇa, the ātman, and at the same time to its macrocosmic equivalent, easily fits into the context of the older *agnicayana* speculations with their meditation on the ātman (see ŚB. 10, 6, 3, 2, where the prāṇa also plays a role) and the threefold homology of fire, sun and prāṇa. This threefold homology, which forms a central theme in MaiU. 6, 33 ff. is, in this upaniṣad, hardly based on the agnihotra. It has better starting-points in the *agnicayana*. In later times meditation on the fire and the self (cf. MaiU. 1, 1) is found in yoga.⁵⁵ Indeed the yoga passages in this upaniṣad seem to be insertions. Insertions, however, usually have some starting-points in the original text. In this case meditation on the ātman (connected with the *agnicayana* esoterism) as well as the sacrifice to the ātman (the prāṇāgnihotra) seem to form the original contents of the text.

Remarkably vague are the references to the actual agnihotra (and its esoteric interpretations as found in the brāhmaṇas). For instance 6, 38 speaks of this rite, but the statement *agnihotraṃ juhvāno lobhajālaṃ bhinatti. ataḥ sammohaṃ chittvā na krodhān stunvānaḥ kāmam abhidhyāyamānaḥ* .. (the text is apparently corrupt) is difficult to connect with any aspect of the actual agnihotra. The piercing of the net of greed would seem to be more suitable in the context of a prāṇāgnihotra bhojana. In fact the very succinct bhoja-

navidhi of BDhŚ. 2, 3, 5, 21 (not explicitly designated as prāṇāgni-hotra) even prescribes that one should take one's meal *kāmakrodha-drohalobhamohān apahrītya*. It is further worth observing that the sentence at the end of this section (6, 38) *śarīraprādeśānguṣṭhamātram anor apy anvyam dhyātvātaḥ paramatām gacchati* may be connected with the meditation on ātman-brahman at the end of the prāṇāgni-hotra when water is poured on the great toe.⁵⁶ Van Buitenen, o.c., p. 62 regards it as an interpolation: "Follows a collection of partial and complete quotations (the thumbsized puruṣa (Sāvitrī 5, 17) ..."

The agnihotra is also mentioned at 6, 36 (*atrodāharanty agni-hotram juhuyāt svargakāmaḥ. yamarājyā agniṣṭomenābhijayati*...). This udāharaṇa, however, is incorrectly regarded as original by van Buitenen.⁵⁷ The context to which it is added here does not deal exclusively with the agnihotra, as appears from *tasmān mantrauśadhājyāmiṣapuroḍāśasthālīpākādibhir yaṣṭavyam antarvedyām*, which evidently refers to sacrifices in general. Moreover the sentence continues (after *yaṣṭavyam antarvedyām*) with *āsny avasṛṣṭair* (emended by van Buitenen to *āsya 'gnyavaṣiṣṭair*) *annapānaiḥ ca* [*āsya āhavanīyam iti matvā*] (the last words are bracketed by van Buitenen). According to Deussen (*Sechzig Upanishad's*), who gives MaiU. 6, 33-38 the heading "Das Opfer und das Prāṇāgni-hotra", the offering in the mouth represents a prāṇāgni-hotra. I doubt, however, if a definite rite (performed twice a day; with a fivehold prāṇāhuti) is meant here. Probably *annapānaiḥ* refers to eating and drinking in general. Moreover *avasṛṣṭaiḥ* ("durch die in den Mund geschobenen Speisen und Getränke") hardly sounds reliable (especially if referring to the prāṇāhutis). Indeed *āsya 'gnyavaṣiṣṭaiḥ* looks preferable, but if one adopts that reading there is even less reason to state that "parallel with the fire-offering there is a prāṇa-offering, a prāṇāgni-hotra" (van Buitenen, p. 58) as the prāṇāgni-hotra rite is not identical with consuming the remains of all sorts of oblations.

Now the theme of this section (6, 36) is the nourishing of the *saṃrddha brahmajyotis*. Apparently brahman is regarded as a two-fold light, flame or lamp. The one form is transcendent, pure (*śānta*; perhaps "not burning", "extinct"; at least it does not need fuel) and has ether (*kham*) as its support or container (*ādhāra*; perhaps the image of a lamp is produced, as may appear from *varttyādhārasneha-yogād yathā dīpasya saṃsthiṭiḥ* in the same section). The other is *saṃrddha*⁵⁸ (thriving or kindled) and always needs nourishment. This

world "feeds" it (*yat saṃrddham idaṃ tasyānnam*).⁵⁹ This *saṃrddha* form of the brahmajyotis is not identified with food as van Buitenen (p. 58) assumes, but depends for its maintenance on the food, nourishment or fuel which it receives from man. By sacrifices one keeps the fire (and perhaps indirectly the sun) *saṃrddha*; by eating and drinking one keeps the other *saṃrddha* form of the *brahmajyotis*, viz. the *prāṇa*, burning. Only the *śānta* form, the transcendent brahman, lies beyond the sphere of human action. So one performs sacrifices *tejasaḥ saṃrddhyai* (i.e. in order to keep the manifestations of the brahmajyotis *saṃrddha*) *punyaḥ lokavijītyarthāyāmṛtatvāya ca*. The udāharaṇa taken from MS. (*agnihotram juhuyāt svargakāmaḥ*...) was added as an appendix which had to explain the other aims of sacrifices (the winning of a *loka* in yonder world and immortality).

Sacrifice in general and not especially the agnihotra plays a role in the section discussed above which has the homology of the three embodied forms of brahman (prāṇa, fire, sun) and their maintenance as its theme. This is elaborated in the next section (6, 37), which presents the maintenance of the *saṃrddha* brahman-fires in a causal connection. The oblation offered in the fires reaches the sun, which sends rain and thereby food for the prāṇa. This may (at least as far as the offering in the fire is concerned) refer to the agnihotra,⁶⁰ but sacrifice in general may as well be meant here.

The threefold homology (fire, prāṇa, sun) is even introduced in the layers of the fire-altar, which generally consists of five *citis*, but in MaiU. 6, 33 seems to have only three (explicitly mentioned) *citis* with *ātmavid* and *brahman* apparently as fourth and fifth. This triple aspect of the fire-altar is not unusual in the brāhmaṇa speculations on the agnicayana, in which the naturally perforated bricks of the first, third and fifth layers are equated with the three worlds (and Agni, Vāyu, Āditya), through which the gold man in the altar (representing the sacrificer) has to pass on his way to immortality, to brahman.⁶¹ MaiU. when treating this *cayana* mixes up several classifications.⁶² Essential is, on the one hand, the gradual rising of the sacrificer to brahman (in five stages) and, on the other hand, the threefold homology of fire, prāṇa and sun. There are some points of agreement with TU. 2, 2, but I doubt if van Buitenen is right in supposing that the MaiU. passage represents a stage between the *agnirahasyam* of ŚB. and the TU. account of the five ātmans.⁶³ In this *cayana* passage the tripartition of the cosmos (which is absent in TU.) offers

a starting-point for the identification with the three fires of the āhitaṅni and with the *pavamāna*, *pāvaka* and *śuci* fires, which together seem to form the digestive fire (*jāthara*). MaiU. 6, 34, however, is not clear in all respects and may contain interpolations. According to Deussen *yataḥ pavamānapāvakaśucisamghāto hi jātharaḥ* refers to the prāṇāgnihotra. Van Buitenen places this sentence between brackets, but his emendation *haviṣkṛtam etenāsye 'nnam* (of *āviṣkṛtam etenāsya yajñam*) seems to imply that he accepts the offering in the internal fires as original. This leaves us with the problem how *tasmād agnir yaṣṭavyaś cetavyaḥ stotavyo 'bhidyātavyaḥ* should be interpreted. In the sentence at the end of this section *ato 'nagnihotryanagnicidanagnyabhidhyāyinaṁ brahmaṇaḥ padavyomānusmaraṇaṁ viruddham* (followed by *tasmād agnir yaṣṭavyaḥ . .*), which is rejected by van Buitenen, *agnir yaṣṭavyaḥ* and *anagnihotrī* apparently should refer to the agnihotra. On the other hand it is difficult to assume that those who were not *agnicit* were excluded from the contemplation of brahman. Probably neither the actual agnicayana nor the actual agnihotra are meant. According to van Buitenen (o.c., p. 50 f.) *cetavyaḥ* was misunderstood by the compiler ("*cetavyaḥ* is more likely to come from *ci* 'to lay a fire' than from *ci* 'to think'"). The confusion of the two roots *ci* may, however, have been the intention of the text. The piling of the altar is a mental operation, a meditation, which transfers the performer to unity with brahman in five successive stages (corresponding to the five layers of the fire-altar). The double meaning of *citi* already figures in ŚB.⁶⁴ TU. 2, 2 likewise implies a (somewhat different) meditation-piling.⁶⁵ So *agnir . . cetavyaḥ* seems to refer to a mental piling of the fire-altar, which probably was already announced MaiU. 1, 1, which calls the cayana a brahmaya-jña. This is not identical with *agnir . . abhidhyātavyaḥ*, which in the context of the prāṇāgnihotra ritual refers to the meditation on the fire which is the ātman. See MaiU. 1, 1 *ātmānam abhidhyāyet* (and this ātman is interpreted as prāṇa, i.e. the internal fire to be meditated upon as identical with the sun and brahman). Meditation does not only precede the prāṇāgnihotra (MaiU. 6, 2 ff.; see especially 6, 9: *tasmād vā ubhayātmaivaṁvid ātmann evābhidhyāyati*), it also forms the conclusion of the rite (MaiU. 6, 9 *ātmejyānaḥ prāṇo 'gnir viśvo 'siti ca dvābhyām ātmānam abhidhyāyet*; 6, 38 *śarīraprādeśāṅguṣṭhamātram anor apy anvyam dhyātvā*). MaiU. 6, 34 also refers to some *abhidhyānas* which deal with the homology of fire, sun and internal fire, and not with the piling itself. Probably *agnir yaṣṭavyaḥ*

and *anagnihotrī* (MaiU. 6, 34) should be connected with that variant of the agnihotra in which the oblation is offered in oneself, in and to the prāṇa.

On account of the identity of sun, prāṇa and fire the fire-ritual is not excluded, but nowhere can one find a special reference to the śrauta agnihotra. The fact that 6, 38 speaks of an agnihotra and not of a prāṇāgnihotra is not decisive. ChU. 5, 24, 2 and ŚāṅkhĀ. 10, 8, 4 similarly call their prāṇāgnihotra an agnihotra. In our interpretation of this upaniṣad van Buitenen's reconstitution of the original MaiU. can be maintained on the whole. Single sentences or even sections may form a matter of debate. Moreover no upaniṣad even in its original form will have formed a complete, coherent unity. If, however, MaiU. 1, 1; 6, 1 ff. and 6, 33 ff. should be taken together as the original upaniṣad, there can be hardly any doubt that not the śrauta agnihotra, but the prāṇāgnihotra and agnicayana speculations (or the mental agnicayana) form the main theme of the text.

NOTES

¹ O.c. II, p. 69.

² See chapter V B.

³ See chapter XI, n. 8.

⁴ *retas* is found only in the ŚāṅkhĀ. version as the sixth of the vital powers. Compare BĀU. 6, 1, 12, where *retas* is mentioned in the context of the *prāṇāḥ*, whereas it is missing in the ChU. version. The addition of a sixth prāṇa shows that this passage is more theoretical than actually based on the prāṇāgnihotra of five libations.

⁵ The identification of *prāṇa* and *vāyu* is very current. For the omission of prāṇa compare ChU. 3, 13, 5. Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*, p. 147 assumes in both passages the omission of *tvac* (the organ of touch) and indeed this word has been inserted in some editions (see Hume's note on his translation of ChU. 5, 23, 2). Undoubtedly, however, the omission of *prāṇa* (and not of *tvac*) is due to the secondary combination of the breaths with the vital powers. The cosmic equations are evidently based on the latter series of *prāṇāḥ*.

⁶ However, this passage perhaps does not deal with a rite. It forms a secondary addition to an agnihotra expiation and speaks of eating and drinking without any clear reference to a fixed prāṇāgnihotra rite.

⁷ This offering of *satya* and *śraddhā* belongs rather to the symbolic interpretations of the agnihotra as dealt with in ch. V B. Cf. also MNU. 543; VaiSmS. 2, 18, 2 f.; PrāṇU. 38 ff. In the ChU. version (5, 18, 2) the mouth is the āhavanīya, mind the anvāhāryapacana, the heart the gārhapatya, the hairs the barhis, etc. These are incidental *ad hoc* identifications, which here are combined with the equations of man and cosmos in the context of the speculations on the Ātman Vaiśvānara.

⁸ Compare ŚB. 2, 3, 1, 8, where the agnihotra is interpreted as tenfold (= *virāj*) on account of the fact that the milk is four times ladled out, twice offered, twice eaten and twice wiped off. See also ŚāṅkhB. 2, 3 (ed. Sarma 2, 4, 1 ff.) for a different tenfold agnihotra which is *virāṭsampanna*. The

tenfold aspect of the *virāj* (which is of course also connected with food in this prāṇāgnihotra context) seems to have been overlooked by Varenne, who reads (probably with the *Ān. S. G. ed.*) *manyur arcayitā* (against Keith *manyur arcir dantā . .*) and thereby produces a ninefold agnihotra.

⁹ See ch. III, n. 18.

¹⁰ Both texts have *ākāśa* where GB. reads *antarikṣam*. Moreover the conclusion of Śāṅkhā. 10 *atha ya idam avidvān agnihotram juhōti yathāṅgārān apohya bhasmani hutam tādṛk tat syāt* strikingly agrees with ChU. 5, 24, 1.

¹¹ Keith, *J.R.A.S.* 1908, p. 373 ff. considers Śāṅkhā. 9 to be an abbreviated and simplified version of ChU. 5, 1-2 and regards Śāṅkhā. 9-11 as fairly late.

¹² These texts do not explicitly mention the fivefold prāṇāhuti and refer to eating and drinking. Śāṅkhā. even includes *retas* as the sixth prāṇa. On the other hand it refers to two daily ascensions to heaven (*rohābhyām rohābhyām*), but this passage can hardly be regarded as an original unity.

¹³ Taken from ŚB. 10, 6, 1.

¹⁴ See ch. III, n. 1.

¹⁵ AA. 2, 1, 4 the gods (= *prāṇāḥ*) praise the prāṇa after the contest. Cf also PrU. 2, 4 ff.

¹⁶ He also refers to ChU. 5, 19-23, where indeed the prāṇāgnihotra is treated, but that passage has no relation to BĀU. 6, 1, 13.

¹⁷ O.c. II, p. 72. Cf. ch. XI, n. 6.

¹⁸ For the ācamana with the formulas *amṛtopastaraṇam asi* and *amṛtāpi-dhānam asi* see VII, n. 11.

¹⁹ See Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*, p. 135, n. 2.

²⁰ Compare the Prāṇa-hymn AV. 11, 4 and the praise of this Prāṇa after the contest PrU. 2, 5 ff. See also MaiU. 7, 7, where the Ātman is described as the *bhūtādhipati* for whom this All is food (*asyaivānnam idam sarvam*). This Ātman is amongst others called Prāṇa. Manu 5, 28 (*prāṇasyānnam idam sarvam prajāpatiḥ akalpayat*) conceives prāṇa to be all life and not the cosmic *adhipati*. The conclusion from the statement that Prajāpati made everything prāṇa's food (*sthāvaram jaṅgamam caiva sarvam prāṇasya bhojanam*), viz. the freedom of eating (some clean) animals, has no connection with the present passage.

²¹ *Sechzig Upanishad's*, p. 135 (tr. of ChU. 5, 2, 1), where he observes in a note: "Hunde und Vögel sind sprichwörtlich dafür bekannt, dass sie alles, auch das Unreinste, essen. (Von einem Gegessenwerden derselben kann natürlich keine Rede sein, wiewohl schon der Redaktor van Bṛh. 6, 1, 14 die Sache dahin zu verstehen scheint)".

²² See also AA. 1, 3, 8 (*sarvāṇi bhūtāny ā pipilikābhyah*); BĀU. 1, 4, 4 (*ā pipilikābhyah*); ChU. 7, 2, 1 (*śvapadāny ākūlapataṅgapipilikam*).

²³ For this passage and its parallel ChU. 4, 1-3 see Lüders, "Die Samvarga-vidyā", *Sb. Akad. Berlin* 1916, p. 278 ff. (= *Phil. Ind.*, Göttingen 1940, p. 361 ff.).

²⁴ See Lüders, *Varuṇa* I, p. 297 ff.

²⁵ For this being clothed in water one may also compare AV. 10, 2, 7 (*sa ā varivarti bhuvaneṣv antar apo vasaṇaḥ ka u tac ciketa*) and the riddles of RV. 1, 164, 30-32, where prāṇa in its microcosmic and macrocosmic aspect plays a role. Or should Prāṇa be interpreted as the wind clothed in the water of the rain?

²⁶ Compare PrU. 2, 5 ff. and the Prāṇa-hymn AV. 11, 4. See Bloomfield, *Hymns of the Atharva-Veda* (S.B.E. 42), p. 622 f., who observes that in the upaniṣads prāṇa is frequently identified with brahman and ātman.

²⁷ See ch. IV, n. 1.

²⁸ This etymology has been included by Tsuji in his "Etymologia upaniṣadica". *J.I.B.S.* 1 (1), p. 256, where, unfortunately, no explanation is given for this type of etymologies. It looks like a variant of the type *annasyānna-tvam*. In most translations this etymology is not correctly rendered. Senart translates the ChU. passage: "En vérité, tout cela est *anna* (nourriture) de l'*ana* (souffle). Car *ana* est le nom générique du prāṇa (du souffle)" (*ano ha vai prāṇasya nāma pratyakṣam*). Cf. also Deussen's "Darum ist dieses alles Nahrung (*annam*) des *Ana* (Odems)". In *tad vā etad anasyānnam*, however, *etad* does not refer to *yat kiṃ cid idam ā śvabhyah . .* in the preceding sentence, but is used like *etad* in the next paragraph (5, 2, 2 *tasmād vā etad aśi-śyantaḥ . . adbhīḥ paridadhātī*). It transfers the listener or reader from the myth to the situation in which we live here. Those sentences with *tasmād vā etad* and *tad vā etad* introduce some (secondary) conclusions to be drawn from the myth. The ultimate consequence of this identification of food and life (*anna* and *ana*, for which *prāṇa* is only a *parokṣam* name) is that no food is *anannam*. Man, dogs, insects are eaters, but together they are consumed by the Eater, viz. Prāṇa. All life and all food belongs together. This also means (for whosoever knows this) that from everybody food may be accepted (*nānannam pratigṛhitam*, BĀU. version). Probably *anannam* here especially refers to the acceptance of food from unworthy persons. For this connotation of *anannam* see Caland, *Altindische Zauberei*, Amsterdam Academy 1908 (repr. Wiesbaden 1968), p. 10 and Rau, *Staat und Gesellschaft im alten Indien* (Wiesbaden 1957), p. 37 (on *anāśyānnasyānnam*). This does not imply that an abolition of all "Speiseverbote" is advocated here (Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*, p. 135 remarks: "solche praktische Tendenzen liegen dem Geiste der Upanishad's fern"). Presumably the meaning is that for those who know this and accidentally may accept food from a *caṇḍāla* expiations are superfluous. Compare the agnihotra expiations, in which sometimes the knowledge of the identity of fires and *prāṇāḥ* or fires and parts of the cosmos makes the passing of something between the fires or the extinction of the fires irrelevant (which does not mean that the fires are neglected or that the passing between the fires is not avoided).

²⁹ See Rau, o.c., p. 34. For Prāṇa as a king see B. Schlerath, *Das Königtum im Rig- und Atharvaveda* (Wiesbaden 1960), p. 22 ff. (on Prāṇa/Vāyu and Prāṇa/Vāta; referring to AV. 11, 4). See also Coomaraswamy, *H.J.A.S.* 6, p. 372 f. on Prāṇa's kingship in this context. PrU. 2, 11 Prāṇa is king and eater.

³⁰ For kingship and garment see AV. 19, 24.

³¹ In the BĀU. version this passage is placed at the end of the *mantha* ceremony (6, 3, 7 ff.). Śāṅkhā. 9, 7 agrees with ChU. (probably its source, see n. 11). According to Deussen (*Sechzig Upanishad's*, p. 133) the transference to the end of the contest (from the *mantha* ceremony) involved the replacement of the verb *siñc-* (in *api ya enam śuṣke sthānau niśiñcet . .*) by *brū-* (ChU. *yady apy etac śuṣkāya sthānave brūyāt . .*). Only in this detail the BĀU. version of this complex of contest, *mantha* ceremony etc. would be more original according to Deussen (o.c., p. 133). On the other hand one may ask whether *api ya enam śuṣke sthānau niśiñcet* refers to an actual pouring out. Even if this is taken as a metaphor (the *mantha* so much stimulates life that it would even reanimate a blasted trunk, i.e. an old decrepit man), the problem remains that the connection with the *mantha* ceremony, which should confer superiority and greatness rather than effect a revival, is far from clear. One may compare Śāṅkhā. 11, 2 *sa yathā mahān vṛkṣa ārdra upasikṭamūlas tiṣṭhed evam haiva sa tasthau*, where in the context the revival of the cosmic

puruṣa by the re-entering *prāṇāḥ* precedes (its body was *riktam iva pariśuśi-ram*) and a rite for averting imminent death follows. Probably the image of the *śuṣka sthānu* has to be placed in a similar context. This image is out of place in the passages of ChU. and BĀU. As to the relation of ChU. and BĀU. it may be observed that in the latter text Satyakāma Jābāla as the last teacher of a *vaṁśa*-list (starting with the typical ŚB. personalities Uddālaka Āruṇi and Yājñavalkya) teaches this mixture to his pupils (*etam u haiva . . antevāsibhya uktvā*) and pronounces (like his predecessors) the sentence *api ya enam śuṣke sthānau niśīncet* . . (6, 3, 12), whereas in ChU. the same Satyakāma is the only teacher. Does the author of BĀU. attempt here to present his version as older than ChU. by means of this *vaṁśa*-list?

³² The aim is to reach *mahat* (*yadī mahaj jīgamiṣet*, ChU. 5, 2, 4; *sa yaḥ kāmāyate mahat prāpnuyām iti*, BĀU. 6, 3, 1). Here *mahat* is not so much "quelque grand objet", "quelque chose de grand" (Senart), "(etwas) Grosses" (Deussen), "something great" (Hume, who in a note on BĀU. 6, 3, 1 compares the ceremony for procuring a special prize at KauṣU. 2, 3) as "greatness, superiority". Cf. JB. 1, 287 *tasmād yad brāhmaṇo mahad iva gacchati* . . "Wenn daher ein Priester in eine hohe Stellung gelangt . . ." (Rau, *Staat und Gesellschaft*, p. 36). Differently D. Schrapel, *Untersuchung der Partikel iva* (thesis Marburg 1970), p. 39, who takes *mahat* as an adjective and supplies *annādyam* from the context, which is tenable in itself, but is not confirmed by the present parallel. The end of the rite (see especially ChU. 5, 2, 8 f.) proves that it is a magical one.

³³ ŚāṅkhĀ. 9 forms a unity like ChU. 5, 1-2. The insertion of the *pañcāgnividyā* in this unity by BĀU. (at least in the Kāṇva rec.; in the Mādhy. rec. it precedes the *mantha* and the contest passages: ŚB. 14, 9, 1) shows this version to be less original. There are more indications. In the ChU. version five libations of butter are offered to the five *prāṇāḥ* denoted as *jyeṣṭha śreṣṭha*, *vasiṣṭha*, etc. in accordance with the introductory passage ChU. 5, 1, 1 ff. In BĀU. the relation to its introductory description of the six *prāṇāḥ* is completely confused. It reads (6, 3, 2) *jyeṣṭhāya svāhā śreṣṭhāya svāhety agnau hutvā manthe samsravam avanayati*, *prāṇāya svāhā vasiṣṭhāya svāhety agnau* . . So *prāṇa*, *vāc*, etc. are connected with the wrong epithets (they have all shifted one place). According to Deussen (o.c., p. 509, n. 1) *prāṇāya svāhā* (*vāce svāhā* etc.) have to be taken with the preceding context as secondary additions. In the Kāṇva rec. the separation from 6, 1, 1 ff. by the insertion of the *pañcāgnividyā* would require this explanatory addition ("um aus derselben in Erinnerung zu bringen, dass unter dem edelsten und besten der Prāṇa, unter der reichsten die Rede, usw. zu verstehen sei"). Here I have some doubts. If indeed *prāṇāya svāhā* should not be taken with *vasiṣṭhāya svāhety*, the omission of *iti* after *svāhā* is difficult to explain, the more so as after *retase svāhā* (which should be an addition like *prāṇāya svāhā*) this *iti* is not missing; it is even followed by the phrase *agnau hutvā manthe samsravam avanayati* (here Deussen suddenly changes his interpretation of *iti* "so spricht er" into "in dieser Weise [spendet er . .]"). The explanation of this odd arrangement of the BĀU. version should start from the fact that *prāṇa* (in 6, 1, 1) was twofoldly characterized: *jyeṣṭhaś ca śreṣṭhaś ca*. This resulted (in 6, 3, 2) in a twofold dedication: *jyeṣṭhāya svāhā śreṣṭhāya svāhā*. This twofold scheme was rather automatically maintained in *prāṇāya svāhā vasiṣṭhāya svāhā* up to *retase svāhā*, where no more qualifications of the *prāṇāḥ* were available. The other dedications (in 6, 3, 3) *agnāya svāhā somāya svāhā* etc., which have no connection with the preceding passage on the contest of the *prāṇāḥ*, are evidently additions if our views on the relation between the

contest and the *mantha* (see below) are correct. The whole *mantha* passage in BĀU. makes the impression of a later elaboration.

³⁴ Here the image of the watered tree suits the context. Cf. n. 31.

³⁵ For *māham akāmo marīṣyāmi* compare *anakāmamāra* (IV, n. 4). For the rite and its formulas *vāci me 'gnih pratiṣṭhito vāg hṛdaye hṛdayam ātmani* . . etc. compare TB. 3, 10, 8, 4 ff. *agnir me vāci śṛitah, vāg ghṛdaye, hṛdayam mayi, aham amṛte, amṛtaṁ brahmaṇi*. According to Sāyaṇa the *kalpa* of this text is: *audumbareṇa pātreṇa yūṣṇo mṛtyave grahaṁ grhṇāti*. Now BĀU. concludes its *mantha* passage with *api ya enam śuṣke sthānau niśīncet* (more suitable in the context of a rite for averting death, as was observed above) and with the statement: *caturaudumbaro bhavaty audumbarah sruva audumbaraś camasaḥ* . . (6, 3, 13). Is there some confusion between the *mantha* rite and the *mṛtyu* rite?

³⁶ On these practical and magical aspects of āraṇyakas and upaniṣads see Edgerton, *J.A.O.S.* 49, p. 97 ff. and *Studies in Honor of Maurice Bloomfield* (New Haven 1930), p. 117 ff.

³⁷ See n. 32.

³⁸ As a parallel to *aham evedaṁ sarvaṁ asāni* (which probably does not belong to the verse) BĀU. has *aham evedaṁ sarvaṁ bhūyāsam* (but not directly after the verse).

³⁹ The terms occurring in the quoted verses are often used in connection with supreme kingship (see Rau, *Staat und Gesellschaft*, p. 72) and the expression *jyeṣṭhaś ca śreṣṭhaś ca svānām bhavati* (BĀU. 6, 1, 1) belongs to the sphere of "Hochadel und Oberkönig" (Rau, o.c., p. 71). The aim of the rite (the reaching of *mahat*) likewise is rather concrete and practical. On sacrifices for becoming *śreṣṭha* or *adhipati* see Rau, p. 71. The mythical contest of the *prāṇāḥ* probably forms a good reflection of the rivalry between the *rājānaḥ* who were struggling for *adhipatyam* (Rau, p. 84). The aim of the rite may be superiority and leadership in the widest sense. Anyhow the rite originally was purely magical (like many others in these texts) and connected with competition and contest. The sentence *aham evedaṁ sarvaṁ asāni* (*bhūyāsam*) (see n. 38) may point to a later adaptation (cf. Deussen, *Sechzig Upanishad's*, p. 132). Does the performer in that case identify himself with Prāṇa as brahman rather than with Prāṇa as the victor of his *samānāḥ* (viz. the *prāṇāḥ*)? Reaching *svārājyam* etc. may refer to *mokṣa*. See e.g. TUBh. 23, 6 (*āpnoti brahmabhūtaḥ svārājyam svarādhāvaṁ svayam eva rājādhipatiḥ bhavati*) and TUBhV. 1, 95 (with tr. and n. by J. M. van Boetzelaer, thesis Utrecht 1971). Should one take *mahat* (see n. 32) as a name of Prāṇa? Cf. Schrader, *Introduction to the Pañcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Saṁhitā*, p. 73. The *mantha* is mentioned by ŚGS. 6, 4, 8 as a subject to be taught to the pupils.

⁴⁰ The basic ideas of the *pañcāgnividyā* are, however, found in its upaniṣad (KauṣU. 1, 1 f.).

⁴¹ *The Maitrāyaṇīya Upaniṣad* (The Hague 1962), p. 44. For the ritual of this passage see ch. VII.

⁴² O.c., p. 38. The text reads . . *tasmād yajamānaś citvaitān agnīn ātmānam abhidhyāyet* (. .) *kaḥ so 'bhidhyeyah. ayam yaḥ prāṇākhyah*. Compare the introductory phrase of 6, 9 (retained by van Buitenen) *tasmād vā ubhayaṭmaivaṁvid ātmann evābhidhyāty ātmann eva yajati*; in his comment van Buitenen, who is probably right in rejecting the following ritualistic prāṇāgnihotra *bhojanavidhi* passage, fails to observe that the sacrifice to the breath(s) forms "the intention of the text". I shall deal with 6, 9 further on.

⁴³ O.c., p. 68 ff. The homology of macrocosmos and microcosmos is said to

be fundamental to the upaniṣad's doctrine and to be "made significant and acted upon in an act of sacrifice" (i.e. the agnihotra). The interpretation of this rite as the daily affirmation of the threefold cosmic order (three fires corresponding to three worlds) does not convince, as the offering is mainly made in the āhavanīya and this interpretation is scarcely supported by the brāhmaṇas dealing with the agnihotra. Moreover I do not see how this conception of the agnihotra could be connected with the homology mentioned above, if man has to be regarded as a microcosmos. On the role of man in this homology van Buitenen (p. 70 f.) observes that he parallels the macrocosmos limb for limb and that according to MaiU. this "identification must repeatedly and consciously be made as a matter of meditation". First it should be noted that generally this sort of parallelism implies the identification of sun and eye, wind and prāṇa, etc., whereas MaiU. predominantly equates sun and prāṇa (and hardly mentions limb for limb parallelisms). In the second place the relation between the meditation on this identity and the actual agnihotra (and its speculations in the brāhmaṇas) is far from clear. In trying to explain this relation van Buitenen gives an excellent characterization of the agnihotra, but loses sight of the fact that MaiU. (rather optimistically dated as "not too much later than the Taittirīya Upaniṣad") in all probability presupposes the existence of the prāṇāgnihotra. Especially the prāṇa-āditya speculations suit the prāṇāgnihotra more than the agnihotra. Consequently the doctrine of this upaniṣad does not seem to derive directly from the actual agnihotra. In other words this text does not (like some brāhmaṇas) form a starting-point for the prāṇāgnihotra, but deals with speculations on an established prāṇāgnihotra ceremony, in which these meditations on prāṇa, sun and brahman are actually practised, as appears from the texts.

⁴⁴ Probably he refers to the *agnyādhāna*. See o.c., p. 14; 37; 39. On the other hand he speaks (p. 45) of the "agnihotra and accompanying ceremonies" which symbolize a simultaneous threefold reproduction: the regeneration of the sun, the nourishing of the sacrificer and the feeding of the fires. The consumption of the remains of the agnihotra libations is, however, not completely identical with the prāṇāgnihotra.

⁴⁵ See o.c., p. 14 ff.

⁴⁶ MaiU. 6, 17 *asyaitad bhāsvaram rūpaṃ yad amuṣminn āditye tapaty agnau cādhumake <hṛdaye ca>* [*udarastho 'tha vā yaḥ pacaty annam ity evaṃ hy āha-*] *yaś caiṣo 'gnau yaś cāyam hṛdaye yaś cāsā āditye sa eṣa ekā iti* (text van Buitenen, p. 47). The same passage is edited by van Buitenen on p. 111 as follows: *asyaitad . . . āditye tapaty [agnau cādhumake yaj jyotiś citrataram udarastho 'tha vā yaḥ pacaty annam/iti/ evaṃ hy āha-]* *yaś caiṣo 'gnau . . . etc.* Apparently the text is not reliable in all respects. There are some interpolations. In MaiU. *evaṃ hy āha* mostly introduces a (presumably later inserted) quotation. So the authority of *yaś caiṣo 'gnau . . . etc.* is doubtful. The original text seems to deal with two "fires": the sun and the smokeless internal fire.

⁴⁷ O.c., p. 38: "The subject is the Fire, which is the Supreme whose embodiments or ātmans are Sun and Prāṇa". Why the Supreme here should be conceived as a Fire, is not clear. It is even doubtful whether the Supreme is the subject of this sentence. One may perhaps even take *eṣa* as referring to man, who has two ātmans. In that case the opening of MaiU. 6, 9 *tasmād vā ubhayātmā evamvid ātmann evābhidhyāyaty ātmann eva yajati* would consist of one sentence with one subject (viz. man who is *ubhayātmā*) and express a similar thought. See Deussen's translation of MaiU. 6, 9: "Darum, fürwahr, hat einer diese beiden [Prāṇa und Sonne] als sein Selbst". Van Buitenen's

analysis of this passage which implies two different subjects and places *evamvid* in initial position is for stylistic reasons hardly acceptable. For man's two ātmans compare JB. 1, 17-18, where (in a completely different context) the agnihotrin has two ātmans (*sa haivam vidvān dvayātmā*), his own ātman and his ātman in the sun. There, however, *ātman* denotes the body or the self rather than the "soul".

⁴⁸ See Kane, *Hist. of Dharmaś.* II, p. 702 (dealing with the *brahmayajña*, the daily study): "... he should begin with the syllable 'om' . . . He recites thrice the Gāyatrī verse . . .". Does MaiU. 1, 1 *brahmayajño vā eṣa yat pūrveṣāṃ cayanam* refer to MaiU. 6, 2 ff.?

⁴⁹ See ch. XI, n. 15, 16, 20 and 26 and Appendix, n. 10 for parallels.

⁵⁰ See n. 47.

⁵¹ For the meaning of the *ātmayajña* see ch. X. Obviously *ātmann evābhidhyāyati* refers to the meditation by means of the gāyatrī which precedes the prāṇāgnihotra and *ātmann eva yajati* to the prāṇāgnihotra *ātmayajña*. Van Buitenen translates the latter sentence "worships in the ātman alone" (p. 44) and "sacrifices into the ātman alone" (p. 137). Probably *yaj-* with loc. here means "to worship (the ātman)". The term *ātmayajña* actually occurs in the next (interpolated) section 6, 10 (*uttaro vikāro 'syātmayajñasya yathānnam annādaś ca*), where van Buitenen (p. 138) takes *ātmayajña* as a bahuvrīhi. There is, however, no parallel for this interpretation. Moreover the usual word for the performer of the *ātmayajña* is *ātmayājīn*, which also occurs at the end of this section. The context by no means favours van Buitenen's view, as 6, 10 probably does not form an introductory commentary on 6, 11 (*param vā etad ātmano rūpaṃ yad annam . . .* "Of the self there is a further form, viz. food"; compare van Buitenen's rendering of 6, 10: "... that there is a further transformation of him who sacrifices into the self, viz. as food and as the eater of food"), but gives the higher (Sāṃkhya) version or modification of the *ātmayajña* described in the preceding section, viz. the prāṇāgnihotra bhojanavidhi, which indeed contains the aspects of eater and being eaten.

⁵² O.c., p. 44: "both [sc. *prāṇa* and *āditya*] are homologized in the esoteric knowledge of the OM *bhūh bhuvaḥ svaḥ* formula and the *sāvitrī*, which together introduce the *agnihotra*. When one has this knowledge of this homology, the actual offering is indeed an *ātmayajña*". Cf. p. 68: "when sacrificing into the fire one who knows this . . . sacrifices in the ātman".

⁵³ O.c., p. 14, n. 3. See also p. 37 (commenting on the *cayanam* in MaiU. 1, 1). Why should the text if dealing mainly with the agnihotra describe the establishment of the fires as an agnicayana?

⁵⁴ See ŚB. 10, 5, 2, 7 *ya eṣa etasmin maṇḍale puruṣo yaś caiṣa hiraṇmayaḥ puruṣo 'yam eva sa yo 'yam dakṣiṇe 'kṣan puruṣaḥ*.

⁵⁵ See Eliade, *Le Yoga* (Paris 1960), p. 85 dealing with a modern "méditation yogique au sujet du 'feu'", where fire, sun and internal fire are identified.

⁵⁶ VaiSmS. 2, 18, 6 . . . *aṇor anīyān iti dakṣiṇapādāṅguṣṭhe saṃsṛāvayet*; BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 11 . . . *dakṣiṇe pādāṅguṣṭhe pāṇi nīsrāvayaty aṅguṣṭhamātrāḥ puruṣaḥ . . . iti*. See also PrāṇU. 25 and MaiU. 6, 9 (where only the meditation on the ātman and not the pouring of water on the toe is mentioned).

⁵⁷ O.c., p. 59 referring to BĀU. 5, 15, 1 and observing that "our present text suggests the ritual background of the esoteric BĀUp. speculation". The udāharāṇa *agnihotram juhuyāt . . .*, however, forms a free quotation of MS. 1, 8, 6 (end) belonging to the agnihotra section.

⁵⁸ For *saṃyaddha-* referring to a kindled form of a fire cf. VāsDhŚ. 30, 6 *vedendhanasamyaddheṣu hutam vipramukhāgniṣu*.

⁵⁹ All translations take *annam* as the subject and supply *ādhāram* from the preceding clause (*aiha yac chāntam tasyādhāram kham*). One either leaves *idam* untranslated (van Buitenen; Miss Esnoul, *Les Upanishad* 15), or somehow translates it (Deussen: "diese Nahrung"; Hume: "food here") without any comment on its peculiar place in the sentence. I take *idam* (this world here and all its contents; cf. *idam sarvam*) as subject. This world feeds the *saṃyaddha* brahma-flame or rather keeps it *saṃyaddha*. Cf. MaiU. 7, 7 *eṣa ho khalu ātmāntarhṛdaye 'nyān iddho 'gnir iva viśvarūpaḥ. asyaivānnam idam sarvam*, where one manifestation of the *saṃyaddha brahmajyotis* is described as a fire.

⁶⁰ Van Buitenen, o.c., p. 60: "The present section refers most concretely to the actual rite of the *agnihotra*". For the water doctrine (here introduced in order to present the maintenance of the three manifestations of the *saṃyaddha brahmajyotis* in a coherent form) of this passage and its connection with the *agnihotra* see VI C. The verse *agnau prāstāhutiḥ* . . (MaiU. 6, 37; rejected by van Buitenen), which summarizes the contents of the section, is found in Manu (3, 76) without any explicit connection with the *agnihotra*.

⁶¹ See Eggeling, *S.B.E.* XLIII, p. XXII. This rising to brahman perhaps also occurs MaiU. 6, 35, where Agni, Vāyu and Āditya as *lohaspṛi* seem to make room for the sacrificer's journey to brahman, the *sarvaspṛi*.

⁶² On the one hand the vertical structure consists of five layers, three of which are (as usual) identified with the tripartite cosmos. Generally the first, third and fifth layer (with the naturally-perforated bricks) represent the three worlds, but here (as at ŚB. 10, 4, 5, 3) the first three are earth, *antarikṣam* and heaven, above which two other layers are found. These three layers are also connected with Agni, Vāyu and Āditya. On the other hand the horizontal structure of the total fire-altar represents a bird consisting of five parts (head, wings, back and tail). MaiU. combines these two approaches and produces three superposed birds. It starts from the most well-known mystic interpretation of the altar-bird, which equates it with the year of five seasons. Compare ŚB. 10, 4, 5, 2 (and MS. 3, 4, 13), where the identification of Agni and the year (besides Agni = Vāyu and Agni = Āditya) refers to Agni as the total fire-altar and not to the first layer. So Agni-Samvatsara now becomes the first item of the tripartition Agni-Vāyu-Āditya. It hands the sacrificer over to Vāyu (in the *antarikṣam*), which is identified with *prāṇa* in in order to get a new fivefold bird consisting of the five *prāṇāḥ* (which have no relation at all to the *antarikṣam*). Here we see that the triple homology of fire, wind and sun is replaced by fire, *prāṇa* and sun. For this new homology, which is very current in MaiU., see ŚB. 10, 2, 6, 16 ff. (fire-altar/fire; man/*prāṇa*; year/sun). So the *adhyātmam* equivalent of the total fire-altar has been made into a second layer (between the *adhidaivam* Āditya and the *adhiyajñam* Agni). On account of the starting-point Agni = Year, however, Āditya could no longer be connected with its cosmic framework, viz. the year, and became involved with more or less ritualistic entities such as *ṛc*, *yajus* and *sāman*, with which, originally, it had no relation. The third layer like the other two is based on an original mystic interpretation of the whole fire-altar. See ŚB. 10, 5, 1, 1 ff., where *vāc* forms a threefold fire-altar consisting of *ṛc*, *yajus* and *sāman*. Now *vāc* is often identified with Indra and Indra with the sun. So the connection with Āditya, heaven and the third layer ultimately is based on the replacement of *vāc* by Indra. The classification Agni/year: Vāyu/*prāṇa*: Āditya/Indra, however is not consistently maintained. Agni hands over the *yajamāna* to Vāyu, but Vāyu gives him to Indra instead of Āditya. Then Indra is equated with Āditya. Compare *prāṇa vai vāyuh prāṇo*

'gniḥ with *asau vā āditya indraḥ saiṣo 'gniḥ*. Van Buitenen translates the latter clause "Indra is yonder sun. The fire is the sun", which on account of the parallelism with *prāṇo vai vāyuh* . . seems correct, but implies that Āditya instead of Indra is connected with *ṛc*, *yajus* etc. Most other translators seem to take Indra as the fire. The confusion in the text (and the translations) is due to the fact that Indra indeed should be connected with *ṛc*, *yajus* etc., but on the other hand is not a fire to be homologized like Āditya with *prāṇa*. In fact the rising to brahman and the three fivefold classifications are not quite successfully combined in this passage.

⁶³ O.c., p. 31 and 33. See also p. 71: "Judging by its contents one should put it not too much later than the Taittirīya Upaniṣad, while some portions, like 6, 33 are definitely older". Apart from the fact that the original situation of this text (in which 1, 1 together with 6, 1 ff. and 6, 33 ff. would seem to form an original unity containing portions older than and younger than TU.) becomes less and less clear to me, I would observe that convincing arguments for the priority of MaiU. 6, 33 are not given. Indeed TU. 2, 2 looks more systematized, but on the other hand MaiU. 6, 33 so much forms a mixture of different approaches that in this respect conclusions are not decisive. The differences between the two passages are striking. In TU. brahman is reached through five internal layers called *ātman*s. From the most corporeal (the *annamaya* *ātman*, in fact the body), by way of the animated (*prāṇamaya*), the rational or mental (*manomaya*) and the intelligent (*vijñānamaya*) self one ultimately arrives at the *ānandamaya* self (which introduces one to the identification with the internal brahman). In MaiU. brahman which lies beyond the sun is the aim of the *cayana*. This is reached through external, cosmic layers such as earth, atmosphere and heaven. According to van Buitenen the parallelism of earth/year in MaiU. and *anna* in TU. "needs no further adstruction; it is on earth through the year that food is grown . .", which fails to convince me. Indeed the "second stage of *Prāṇa* is identical" (o.c., p. 31), but only to some extent. The *prāṇāḥ* in the internal, second "layer" of TU. are quite in place, whereas in MaiU. these *prāṇāḥ* had to be introduced in the cosmic, external layer by means of the identification of Vāyu and *prāṇa*. In the third layer the Vedas figure as bricks. They could only be connected with the third cosmic layer of MaiU. through the identifications Āditya = Indra = (*vāc*) (see n. 62). In TU. the adaptation to the *manomaya* *ātman* is not more artificial. The *ātmavid*, which somehow seems to represent the fourth layer in MaiU., hardly makes sense in the external *cayana*. It looks more like an internal layer. This knower of the *ātman*/brahman may be based on a source similar to TU., where in this position the *vijñānamaya* *ātman* is quite suitable. Van Buitenen has convincingly emended MaiU. *eso 'gniḥ puruṣavidhaḥ* to *eso 'gniḥ puruṣavidhaḥ* by comparing TU. *sa vā eṣa puruṣavidha eva*. Perhaps the corruption *-vidhaḥ* was due to *ātma vid*. Now it is remarkable that *puruṣavidhaḥ* definitely makes sense in TU. It occurs only in the second and following layers and has to explain that the less corporeal *prāṇa*-, *mano*-, *vijñāna*- and *ānandamaya* *ātman*s represent a human body just like the *annamaya* *ātman*, which in fact is identical with the body. On this point see also TUBhāṣyavārtikam 2, 252 (transl. by J. M. van Boetzelaer, thesis Utrecht 1971). In MaiU. only the first three layers are *puruṣavidha*. There is scarcely any reason why they should be called *puruṣavidha* (why should the fivefold year be a person?), except if one takes into account that according to the text every layer throws the sacrificer to the next layer with his hands (*kārair* . . *utkṣiptvā*). Most probably *puruṣavidha* like *ātmavid* and the *prāṇāḥ* is based on TU. (or a related source). There is

no reason to regard the external piling of MaiU. (with irregular "internal" features) as the source of the internal piling in TU.

⁶⁴ See e.g. ŚB. 6, 2, 3, 1 *etaḍ vai devā abruvan, cetayadhvam iti citim icchateti vāva tad abruvan*, where *cetay-* ("to reflect") and *ci-* ("to pile") are connected, as Eggeling observes in a note (p. 186). This sentence occurs passim in the agnicayana section of ŚB.

⁶⁵ TU. speaks of five ātmans, TUBh. and TUBhV. of five *kośāḥ*. See J. M. van Boetzelaer, o.c., p. 93 f. (in a note on the transl. of TUBhV. 2, 235). See also TUBhV. 2, 242 ff. referring to mental layers: *tasmād evaṃ citir etā mānasīr vyācacaḥṣire (..) citim evaṃ vicintayet. upāsīnaś citir evaṃ vidvān*

CHAPTER TEN

THE PERFORMERS OF THIS PRĀṆĀGNIHOTRA IN THE TEXTS DISCUSSED

The prāṇāgnihotra passage found in GB. forms a secondary addition to Uddālaka's discussion on the agnihotra expiations¹ and therefore does not give any reliable information on the prāṇāgni-hotrins. Nor does the passage of ŚāṅkhĀ. In ChU. the prāṇāgni-hotra is taught by the kṣatriya Aśvapati, who states before his discussion with the brahmins on Ātman Vaiśvānara: *yakṣyamāṇo vai bhagavantah aham asmi. yāvad ekaikasmā ṛtviḥ dhanam dāsyāmi tāvad bhagavadbhyaḥ dāsyāmi* (ChU. 5, 11, 5). This might imply (if taken at face-value) that originally the prāṇāgnihotra was connected with householders (or even particularly with kṣatriyas) as the institutors of śrauta rites. The discussion with the brahmins, however, occurs already ŚB. 10, 6, 1 (with Agni Vaiśvānara instead of Ātman Vaiśvānara), where the sacrifice to the breaths does not form the conclusion of the debate. Apparently this prāṇāgnihotra passage was later combined with the Vaiśvānara discussion and the introductory passage does not tell us anything on the performers of the prāṇāgni-hotra. From what source Aśvapati or the author of the upaniṣad took their inspiration remains uncertain. However, the form in which this sacrifice to the breaths is presented here can only be intended for the householder and every reference to hermits or ascetics is lacking. One may note that after every āhuti the conclusion runs: *tasyānu tṛptim tṛpyati prajayā paśubhur annādyena tejasā brahmavarcasena*. The treatment of the prāṇāgnihotra in MaiU. does not allow for any definite conclusions on the performers. MNU. contains the mantras of the rite.

Varenne² devotes a large study to the meaning of this text. In his view the upaniṣad forms a unity and deals with the mental sacrifice, especially the prāṇāgnihotra, which would exclusively be performed by samnyāsins and hermits who have retired to the forests for contemplation and deliverance.³ Now the problem with *mantrapāṭhas*, a category to which MNU. at least partly belongs, is that they do not give much information on the ritual in which they are used. Without their complement, the sūtras or śāstras, they form rather obscure

collections of mantras. In the case of the prāṇāgnihotra mantras we have a clear description of their ritual in BDhŚ. For reasons which we shall examine later, Varenne assumes that in that text the prāṇāgnihotra is prescribed for "Anachorètes" and "Renonçants". This view, which I do not share, seems (together with the unfounded assumption of a uniform MNU.) to have caused his misunderstanding of this upaniṣad. These prāṇāgnihotra mantras only form part of this mantrapāṭha. The rest of the mantras belongs to ordinary daily rites such as *snānam*, *saṃdhyāvandanam*, etc. According to Varenne all these daily duties are mentally performed by the yogins for whom this MNU. was composed.⁴ It should be noted, however, that even saṃnyāsins actually bathe⁵ and that there is no proof for assuming that all the rites for which MNU. provides the mantras are performed mentally. If Varenne's view were correct, this would imply that the whole set of daily ritual duties of the householder was adopted by the saṃnyāsin, who replaces the actual performance by a mental one, and that especially for these saṃnyāsins MNU. forms the mantrapāṭha of their mental rites. In that case a mantrapāṭha would be superfluous (the only difference with the *grhastha* ritual being the mental instead of the actual performance). A separate mantrapāṭha for saṃnyāsins would only make sense if it contained wholly esoteric, secret mantras which are not used in the daily rites of the householder. This is not the case. The *saṃdhyā* mantras e.g. are found in several other texts in which they are not explicitly prescribed for hermits and ascetics.⁶ If, moreover, the saṃnyāsin ritual would be just a mental substitute of the ordinary daily rites, one may ask why the agnihotra has not been replaced by a truly mental performance (instead of the prāṇāgnihotra, which is anything but mental), in which the sacrificer performs the whole rite in thought, and that at daybreak (instead of at noon when the first meal is taken). The systematic, chronological arrangement of the MNU. mantrapāṭha shows that the prāṇāgnihotra, which forms the last ritualistic section of MNU., should coincide with the *bhojana-vidhi*, the last of the daily religious duties as described in the dharma literature (the rites after the first bhojanam representing only a slightly modified repetition⁷ of the morning rites). This special, final position of the prāṇāgnihotra section in MNU. should therefore not induce us to follow Varenne in attaching too much importance to that rite in the totality of the text. The prāṇāgnihotra forms a relatively small part of the ritualistic contents of this upaniṣad.

The other, preceding rituals are not some sort of preparation for a central prāṇāgnihotra.

On what grounds does Varenne consider this text to be a book of prayers for hermits and ascetics, a book which, moreover, deals exclusively with mental sacrifices? First one may note his remarks (o.c., p. 6) on the fact that MNU. (as the tenth book of TĀ.) belongs to an āraṇyaka, a category of texts in which the prāṇāgnihotra as a typical "forest" rite of vānaprasthas and saṃnyāsins would be quite appropriate and in which it is actually found sometimes.⁸ Now the āraṇyakas may deal with texts to be studied or rites to be performed outside the village — the lines of demarcation between brāhmaṇas, āraṇyakas and upaniṣads are, however, floating and a last book often forms a later addition —, but this does not imply a permanent stay in the forest. See ch. V B (n. 7). Several daily rites such as *snānam* and *saṃdhyā* of which the mantras are found in MNU. are performed by ordinary *grhasthas* outside the home and the village. At most one may say that the āraṇya and the āraṇyaka are connected with a temporary, esoteric, out-of-village sphere, and as such TĀ. may be supposed to contain a mantrapāṭha such as MNU. for rites which have these esoteric aspects. The *mānasam yajñam* (the mental sacrifice), which according to Varenne should form the central theme of this upaniṣad, is, as far as the term is concerned, fictitious, since to my knowledge no neuter form of *yajña-* is found in Sanskrit. Moreover the statement that MNU. "promeut avec tant d'instance [my spacing] la doctrine du culte mental (*mānasam yajñam*)" (o.c., p. 6) is, to put it mildly, rather exaggerated in view of the fact that the mantrapāṭha portion hardly puts forward a doctrine and that the word *mānasam* (nominative; for obvious reasons without *yajñam*) occurs only twice (515; 529) in this text (in a section which glorifies the *saṃnyāsa*, but apparently forms a later addition to TĀ. 10). In the final section of the text in which *mānasam* is found several other supreme aims of life such as *tapas*, *dama*, *dānam*, *agnihotram*, *yajña*, etc. are passed in review and rejected as inferior to *nyāsa*, i.e. *saṃnyāsa*. Now *mānasam* figures in this enumeration as the eleventh (after agnihotra and *yajña*), the last before *nyāsam*. Varenne (o.c. I, p. 129) observes on this passage: "... une liste deux fois reprise (505-517 puis 518-529) de ce que les uns ou les autres peuvent tenir pour l'activité essentielle: devoir de caste, observances morales et rituelles, etc. rien n'étant supérieur en réalité, au culte mental (*mānasam yajñam*) et à la vie renoncée". One may ask

why in this list of twelve items the eleventh (*mānasam*) should be taken with the last and regarded as superior to the preceding ten.⁹ The text reads *tāni vā etāny avarāṇi parāṃsi nyāsa evātyarecayat* "All those lower supreme aims¹⁰ have been surpassed by *saṃnyāsa*" (MNU. 516). Evidently *mānasam* belongs together with sacrifice and asceticism to the eleven lower *parāṃsi*, as is also Sāyaṇa's interpretation.¹¹ Strangely enough Varenne admits in his second volume (p. 41) that *nyāsa* indeed surpasses all the eleven preceding supreme aims of life: "en fait, ce ne sont ni les *vertus morales* (505-511), ni les *actes rituels* (512-514) ni même l'*ésotérisme* [the spacing is mine] (515) qui doivent nous retenir, mais le *renoncement* (*nyāsa*, 516) . . .". The admission seems to involve a change of terminology. Suddenly *mānasam* is no longer a *mānasam yajñam*, a "sacrifice mental" or "culte mental", but "ésotérisme" and (on the same page, referring to 529) "connaissance ésotérique".

More serious than this rather misleading switch is the fact that Varenne does not draw the conclusion from this new interpretation and writes (o.c. II, p. 43) on MNU. as a mantrapāṭha and its final section (the *saṃnyāsa-upaniṣad*: 505-550): "Bréviaire enfin, qui s'adjoint, en conclusion, une sorte de commentaire non-liturgique, exposant le bénéfice que l'on retire des exercices spirituels préalable-ment évoqués". So he keeps interpreting the mantra collection as belonging to mental sacrifices and these mental sacrifices as the highest aim of the *saṃnyāsin* in the final section of the *upaniṣad*. He refers o.c., p. 44 to MNU. 538 ("le renoncement surpasse toutes les Ardeurs") for proving that the *upaniṣad* "concerne seulement le brāhmaṇe . . . qui renonce à la vie mondaine pour se retirer au désert et y mener l'existence contemplative des anachorètes" (o.c., p. 43) without noticing that this "renoncement" is described as superior to *mānasam* in the final section of MNU. If *mānasam* should now denote the mental sacrifice¹² "dont tant d'exemples sont proposés dans le corps de l'ouvrage (notamment le *prāṇāgnihotra*)" (o.c. II, p. 25), this would imply that the final section of MNU. conflicts with the main part of the text on account of its rejection of *mānasam* as inferior to *nyāsam*. This final section, however, should form a unity with the rest of the text in Varenne's theory which tries to show that *saṃnyāsins* and other people in the forests perform the *prāṇāgnihotra* and other "mental" rites for which MNU. provides the "Bréviaire".

I desist from quoting more passages from Varenne's work which

show this rather confusing approach of the relationship between *mānasam* and *saṃnyāsa* and will give a short analysis of MNU. In this text one may distinguish those mantras or formulas that have a (more or less clear) ritualistic application from the other sections of a more *upaniṣadic* character. Deussen (following in this the Oupnekhat) only translates "die upanishad-artigen Partien", but is not very systematical in his choice. Varenne o.c. II, p. 8 f. distinguishes "trois sections 'originales' (cosmogonie initiale, 1 à 64; exaltation de Nārāyaṇa, 201 à 260; et pour finir *saṃnyāsa-upaniṣad*, 505 à 550)" between which "s'intercalent des sections 'rituelles'", but maintains his assumption that MNU. represents a unity. The greater part of MNU consists of mantras with a "ritual" function. This mantrapāṭha for several, apparently daily rites,¹³ which by no means are exclusively performed by *saṃnyāsins* or hermits, may therefore be regarded as the original framework of the text.¹⁴ The section 201-260 (or according to Deussen o.c., p. 249: 235-260), on which the name Mahā Nārāyaṇa of this *upaniṣad* is based, makes the impression of an insertion in this fairly systematical collection of mantras and formulas to be recited from daybreak to noon.¹⁵ Nowhere else is Nārāyaṇa so emphatically invoked in this text, which also contains sections in which other gods are worshipped.¹⁶ It is to be observed that this section together with its "prolongement attendu de l'enseignement donné" (Varenne o.c. II, p. 37), i.e. the adoration of the sun and the *puruṣa* in the sun, is concluded with *ity upaniṣat*. In the same way the final section (the *saṃnyāsa-upaniṣad*) and its subsections¹⁷ end with *ity upaniṣat*. Apparently here *upaniṣad* marks the termination of a rounded whole or a chapter as in TU. and Nṛsiṃhapūrvatāpaniya Upaniṣad (see Deussen's index to his *Sechzig Upanishad's s.v.* Upanishad). One may probably assume three layers: a) the mantrapāṭha for the *āhnikā* (without any special relation to *saṃnyāsins*); b) an insertion especially dealing with the worship of Nārāyaṇa in the centre of the text (perhaps 201-269); c) an addition, viz. a *saṃnyāsa-upaniṣad* (505-550) consisting of three parts. Only this final *saṃnyāsa-upaniṣad* and the central *upaniṣad* contain references to *saṃnyāsins*¹⁸ which are adduced by Varenne as proofs for his view that the whole work was intended for *saṃnyāsins* and hermits. This proof is not convincing because of the apparent lack of unity in MNU. Regarding the first section of the text, viz. the hymn to Prajāpati, one may perhaps conclude that it belongs to the original mantrapāṭha. As MNU. 67 (*uddīpyasva*

jātavedah . .) evidently is connected with the moment of daybreak when the fire is resuscitated and the following sections (dealing with *saṃdhyā*, *snānam*, *vaiśvadevam*, *bhojanam* and other daily duties) more or less maintain the chronological order of these āhnikas, one may assume that 1-64 having a function in daily life should be recited or meditated upon before daybreak. According to some texts one must, indeed, contemplate God or recite some hymns on arising (before sunrise). See Kane, *Hist. of Dharmaś.* II, p. 647 f. and K. Rangachari, "The Sri Vaishnava Brahmans", *Bull. Madras Govt. Mus.* 2 (2), p. 49 f. Of course the hymns to be recited (in thought or muttered) differed according to community, school or sect. The Prajāpati hymn in MNU. may have been one of them. That Prajāpati and not Nārāyaṇa was invoked or worshipped could be a proof that the central Nārāyaṇa section forms a later addition. In conclusion I should like to observe that, if my interpretation of MNU. is correct, this text, in which the *prāṇāgnihotra* is a *bhojanavidhi*, does not give much reliable information on the performers at least not on their being *saṃnyāsins* or *vānaprasthas*. Probably MNU. or TĀ. 10 provides as a *mantrapāṭha* the mantras for the daily duties and rites of the *grhasthas*.

On the *prāṇāgnihotra* occurring in BDhŚ. (2, 7, 12) Varenne o.c., p. 81 observes: "Venant immédiatement après une section où il est beaucoup question d'Anachorètes et de Renonçants, on doit supposer que le rite est prescrit à ceux-ci seulement". The preceding section indeed deals also with *vānaprasthas* (here called *vaikhānasas*) and *parivrājakas*. It should, however, be borne in mind that this section (2, 6, 11) starts with the five *mahāyajñas* in the framework of an elaborate treatment of the daily rites (from 2, 4, 7 to 2, 7, 13, from *saṃdhyā* and *snānam* to the *bhojanavidhi*). BDhŚ. 2, 6, 11, 9 ff. more or less forms an excursus, in which the interpretation of TS. 5, 7, 2, 3 *ye catvāraḥ pathayo devayānā antarā dyāvāprthivī viyanti* . . as referring to the four āśramas is quoted and ultimately rejected. The author (who at the end of 2, 6, 11 seems to favour the institution of the *grhastha*) interprets the four paths as four kinds of sacrifices. Now the *prāṇāgnihotra* passage is introduced with *atha śālīnayāyāvarāṇām ātmayājinaṁ prāṇāhutiṁ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ* (2, 7, 12, 1). The use of different appellations indicates that the *śālīnas* and *yāyāvaras* are not identical with the *vānaprasthas* and *saṃnyāsins* of the excursus 2, 6, 11, 9 ff. Moreover the *śālīnas* are, as Varenne (o.c., p. 81) admits, mostly "maîtres de maison". He therefore sug-

gests that these *śālīnas* may be "ces brâhmanes chefs de famille, dont parle aussi Manu (6, 95-96) qui "renoncent" (à leurs devoirs sociaux et religieux), tout en demeurant au foyer "sous la tutelle de leurs fils" (Manu, *ibid.*)", or that they may be hermits with a fixed abode as distinct from the *yāyāvaras*, who are "vagants". Further on (p. 82, n. 1) he observes: "'śālīna' et 'yāyāvara' sont des adj.: 'demeurant sur place' (= anachorètes forestiers), et 'vagants' (= Renonçants complets), plutôt que des noms propres". Now *śālīna* and *yāyāvara* frequently occur as technical terms for particular sacrificers or social groups and are not simple adjectives.¹⁹ BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 2 moreover states that one should perform this *prāṇāhuti* after the other obligatory rites (i.e. presumably all the daily rites described in the preceding sections) have been finished (*sarvāvaśyākāvasāne*) which does not seem to suit the situation of the "Renonçants complets".²⁰ Varenne's explanation "Le rituel 'ordinaire' n'est pas supprimé . . c'est qu'il s'agit ici d'un *grhyasūtra* (rituel privé)" hardly carries conviction, since in this *dharmaśāstra* definite rules for the four orders are given (and in the excursus 2, 6, 11, 9 ff. the *vaidikāni karmāṇi* are prohibited for *saṃnyāsins*). VaiDhS. 1, 5 (= VaiSmS. 8, 5) explicitly states that these *śālīnas* and *yāyāvaras* together with two other groups form the four kinds of *grhasthas*, who are said to perform all sorts of Vedic sacrifices. See also Āśrama Upaniṣad 2 and Kane, *Hist. of Dharmaś.* II, p. 641 ff. These *śālīnas*, *yāyāvaras* etc. *gārhaṣṭhyam dharmam anutiṣṭhati* (VaiSmS. 4, 2). That BDhŚ. likewise regards them as householders may appear from places such as 4, 5, 27 f.; 2, 10, 17, 3; 2, 10, 18, 4 and especially 2, 7, 13, 9 discussing the omission of the *prāṇāgnihotra* by householders. So one may conclude that Varenne's views of the performers of the *prāṇāgnihotra* are untenable, at least as far as BDhŚ. is concerned.

On the other hand ascetics apparently were not excluded from the sacrifice in or to the breaths. BDhŚ. 2, 10, 18, 8 f. (in the section dealing with rules for ascetics) homologizes the five *prāṇāḥ* (breaths) with the five fires: *pañca vā ete 'gnaya ātmasthāḥ | ātmany eva juhoti || sa eṣa ātmayājña ātmaniṣṭha ātmapratiṣṭha ātmānam kṣemaṁ nayatīti vijñāyate*. The *saṃnyāsin's* meal is regarded as an *ātmayājña* in which the *prāṇāḥ* represent the fires, i.e. as a *prāṇāhuti*. This term (or *prāṇāgnihotra*) is, however, not mentioned and the mantras to be recited before and after the meal have no relation to any *prāṇāgnihotra* passage. Bühler (*S.B.E.* XIV) wrongly translates the intro-

ductory sentence *ādhānaprabhṛti yajamāna evāgnayo bhavanti* (2, 10, 18, 8) "After the Brahmādhāna the sacrificer himself (contains) the sacrificial fires". The word *brahmādhāna* is not found in the text and his note "Regarding the Brahmādhāna, see above, II, 10, 17, 19" is also a mystification, since that passage mentions a *brahmānvādhāna* and not a *brahmādhāna* or *ādhāna*. Obviously the translation should run "From the time of the setting up (of the fires) these fires are situated in the sacrificer himself". Here the consequences are drawn from the speculations on the *agnyādhāna*²¹ and the actual sacrifice in the fires (which are equated with the *prāṇāḥ*) is replaced by the sacrifice in the *prāṇāḥ*, by the *bhojanam*. The absence of any connection with *prāṇāgnihotra* passages in other texts (such as MNU.) is striking.

With regard to the *prāṇāgnihotra* passage in VaiSmS. Varenne (o.c., p. 74) gives too much emphasis to the fact that this text often refers to hermits and ascetics.²² His interpretation of MNU. as a "Bréviaire du Renonçant" does not receive any support from VaiSmS.²³ Unless explicitly stated to be intended for hermits or *saṃnyāsins* all the rites are prescribed for householders or for every order of religious life. Special rites for hermits are hardly found in the *gṛhya* section.²⁴ A subject such as the *bhojanam* (which in our view is identical with the *prāṇāgnihotra* of MNU. and BDhŚ., and of the later texts, with which we shall deal in the next chapter) more belongs to the *dharma* than to the *gṛhya* literature. The *bhojanavidhi* is indeed treated at VaiSmS. 9, 14 (i.e. in the *dharma* section) in the context of the rules of conduct for virtuous men (*dharmyaṃ sadācāram*, 9, 9; relating to all the four orders). This *bhojanam* contains the essential elements of the *prāṇāgnihotra*: drinking of water before and after the meal with *amṛtopastaranam asi*, *amṛtāpidhānam asi*, and the *prāṇāhuti* (*vidhinā prāṇāhutir hutvā*). The ceremony should be performed *homānte* (cf. BDhŚ. *sarvāvaśyakāvasāne*) and *caturāśropalīpte maṇḍale* (cf. BDhŚ. *saṃmṛṣṭopalīpte deśe*). A more elaborate description of the *prāṇāgnihotra* is found in the *gṛhya* section (VaiSmS. 2, 18; see Varenne, o.c., p. 74 ff.) to which the *dharma sūtra* seems to refer (*vidhinā prāṇāhutir hutvā*). The tenth book gives some special rules for householders (10, 1 ff.), hermits (10, 5) and ascetics (10, 6 f.), among which are prescriptions on the *bhojanam*. For the householder (10, 1): *homānte* (cf. 9, 14) . . . *mitam prāśya* . . .; for the (*apatnīka*) hermit (10, 5): *prāṇayātramātram annam bhikṣuvad aśnāti*; for the ascetic (10, 7): *prāṇāgnihotra-*

vidhānenātmayajñam saṃkalpya prāṇayātramātram aṣṭau grāsān vāśnīyād. The mantras to be recited before the *saṃnyāsina's* *bhojanam* (*ud u tyam . . . ; brahma jajñanam . . .*) are the same as in the BDhŚ. passage on the ascetic's meal (2, 10, 18, 7) and have no parallels in *prāṇāgnihotra* contexts. Obviously 10, 7 refers back to 2, 18 (*atha prāṇāgnihotravidhānam*). On the other hand the ordinary *bhojanavidhi* of 9, 14 also seems to refer to 2, 18. Probably *ātmayajñam saṃkalpya* (Caland translates: "Having after the manner of the sacrifice into the breath, formulated his intention of offering to the All-soul") more particularly refers to the introductory part of 2, 18 rather than to the ritualistic *bhojanavidhi* portion. In this introduction of 2, 18 (ending with *tad evam ekādhvanyur ātmayajñam saṃkalpya*) it is said that the *ātman* is the *yajamāna*, the *buddhi* his *patnī* (. . .), the *viśayāḥ* are the *havīṃsi* and the organs of sense the sacrificial implements. This has obviously no relation to a *prāṇāgnihotra* rite in which food forms the oblation, but may be compared with MNU. 543 ff.; ŚāṅkhĀ. 10, 8 and PrāṇU. 38 ff.²⁵ This upaniṣad-like passage looks like an insertion in this *gṛhya* context. On the other hand it is not unusual to combine the purely mental "sacrifice" (not a real sacrifice with a fixed, momentary ritual, as appears from the identification of *viśayāḥ* and *havīṃsi*) and the non-mental *prāṇāgnihotra* (performed twice a day with concrete oblations) or *bhojanas* in general. Even a *śāstra* as VāsDhŚ. contains in the context of gifts and the feeding of brahmins (30, 7: "The offering made through the mouth of a brahmin . . . is more excellent than an *agnihotra*") a similar set of identifications (30, 5), but presents them as a quotation from a (lost) Kāthaka source.²⁶

I shall deal presently with the problem of the *ātmayajña* in general as well as in connection with the *prāṇāgnihotra*. It may be observed that at least in VaiSmS. 2, 18 the equation of *prāṇāḥ* and fires on the one hand suits the conception of the *prāṇāgnihotra* and on the other hand provides the same theoretical foundation of the ascetic's *ātmayajña-bhojanam* as occurs BDhŚ. 2, 10, 18, 8 (*ādhānaprabhṛti yajamāna evāgnayo bhavanti*).²⁷ It is perhaps especially with regard to this theoretic *ātmayajña* passage that VaiSmS. 10, 7 refers to 2, 18. The ascetic's *bhojanam* is not necessarily identical with the *prāṇāgnihotra* in all its ritualistic details. If now this *prāṇāgnihotra* is neither exclusively connected with *saṃnyāsins* (otherwise it would have been described at VaiSmS. 10, 7), nor with the householders (on account of 9, 14 no details are given at 10, 1, but 9, 14

differs in some points from the bhojanavidhi of 2, 18), one may ask what is the function of the prāṇāgnihotra passage in the grhya section (2, 18). Its position in the context (the *samāvartanam* of the *snātaka*) and the fact that the text speaks of an *ātmayajña*, may have induced the Prayoga (see Caland, VaiSmS. translation, p. 65, n. 1) to make it refer to the *naiṣṭhikasnātaka*, who should be an *ātmayājīn*. The *sūtra*, however, is not a mantrapāṭha, but a ritual handbook with definite instructions and would therefore hardly omit mentioning that this rite should be performed only by the (relatively small group of the) *naiṣṭhikasnātakas*. Now it is remarkable that the prāṇāgnihotra is not mentioned in the enumeration of the contents (1, 1). In this it agrees with other *āhnikas* such as *snānam*, *samdhya*, *tarpanam*. These daily ceremonies intended for all the āśramas are treated at the beginning of the text (1, 2 ff.) before the systematic treatment of the "sacraments" (from the *upanayanam* to the tonsure: 2, 3-3, 23). The *vaiśvadevam* ritual (which precedes the prāṇāgnihotra bhojanam in daily life) occurs 3, 7 among the duties of the newly married pair (3, 1-4 deals with marriage), which is quite logical, as the fire-ritual is only performed by householders and (some) hermits from the time of the first establishment of the fire, i.e. marriage. Other daily rituals, e.g. the grhya agnihotra (6, 15) and the five *mahāyajñas* (6, 17), have been relegated to the addenda dealing with *prāyaścittis*.²⁸ The position of the prāṇāgnihotra as a daily rite (*evam sāyamprātaḥ prāṇāgnihotraṁ yajet. ātmayājīnām idam ijjam agnihotraṁ yāvajjīvakam*) at 2, 18 before the marriage ritual and after or coinciding with the *samāvartana* seems to imply that it was not intended for all the āśramas according to VaiSmS.²⁹ Because it was a sacrifice, it could perhaps originally not be performed by the student. On the other hand it requires no fires and therefore was quite suitable for the unmarried *snātaka*. The upaniṣad-like introduction of 2, 18 (which does not entirely agree with the prāṇāgnihotra, as was observed above) perfectly suited the situation of the unmarried *snātaka*: he cannot be a *yajamāna* and has no wife, but his *ātman* is the *yajamāna* and his *buddhi* is the *patnī*. The prāṇāgnihotra probably constitutes here the first bhojanam of the *snātaka* after the conclusion of his studentship. Manu 7, 82 ordains the kṣatriya to honour the *samāvartins* (probably with a *bhojanam*) and continues with the statement that the offering made through the mouth of a brahmin is superior to the agnihotra (7, 84). Remarkably VāsDhŚ. 30, 7 (the parallel of Manu 7, 84) is preceded by the

same sort of *adhiyajñam* - *adhyātmam* equations (VāsDhŚ. 30, 5: the Kāṭhaka quotations; see above) as are found in the introduction of VaiSmS. 2, 18.³⁰ Are we to infer that the *samāvartin's* *bhojanam* as part of a guest-reception constituted the first occasion for the performance of a prāṇāgnihotra? In fact this bhojana would form a double substitute for the actual agnihotra: for the kṣatriya, who already in the oldest sources is said to replace the actual performance by feeding brahmins,³¹ and for the *samāvartin*, who does not as yet have his fires. One may also bear in mind that the madhuparka formulas *amṛtopastaraṇam asi* and *amṛtāpidhānam asi* have been transferred from the incidental guest-reception (e.g. at the *samāvartana*³²) to the daily bhojanavidhi. These vague points of agreement (in which the śrāddha bhojana also may be included) do not seem to warrant the conclusion that the feeding of the brahmin-guest was the original and sole starting-point for the daily prāṇāgnihotra. At most one might say that it has contributed to the prāṇāgnihotra as we know it in its definite form from BDhŚ.

Now VaiSmS. makes the *samāvartana* coincide with the visit to the future father-in-law, the *kanyāprada*. The result of this secondary combination seems to be an accumulation of bhojanas. First the *argha* guest-reception with the *madhuparka* is described (2, 16). Then (2, 17) there is a dinner (*dhāma bhuñjīta*) together with the relatives (*bāndhavaiḥ saha*) after some brahmins have been fed. Does this take place at the *kanyāprada's* house after the madhuparka? This is followed by the description of the prāṇāgnihotra (2, 18), which is concluded with the statement *tad evaṁ bhuktvā gacchantam . . sāmāpūrvam mātā pitā gurur vā . . vārayed* "So he (viz. a *Snātaka*) who, having partaken of food in this manner, goes (on a pilgrimage to sacred places), must be checked³³ by his mother, his father or his spiritual Teacher, who think kindly of him . . ." (tr. Caland). In a note Caland observes that "*tad* is not very clear: *tasmāt kāraṇāt*, the Bhāṣya". One expects *tad* to be the object of *bhuktvā*. Does *tad* refer to *dhāma* in 2, 17 (*bāndhavaiḥ saha dhāma bhuñjīta*) and was the prāṇāgnihotra passage in its present form inserted in this context which describes the *snātaka's* first bhojana (as part of the *samāvartana*)? Whether inserted or not the prāṇāgnihotra passage seems to have been included in the grhya text at this stage because the first performance of the rite was regarded to take place at this point. Thereafter it may be performed daily by those who are *ātmayājīns* (*ātmayājīnām idam ijjam agnihotraṁ yāvajjīvakam*).

Who are those *ātmayājins* and what is the exact meaning of an *ātmayājña*? Information on this point is scarce. Coomaraswamy's paper on the *ātmayājña*³⁴ is rather disappointing. He completely confuses the concepts of the self as the oblation, the self as the officiant and the self (or the cosmic ātman) as the object of the sacrifice. It should, however, be admitted that the ideas of *ātmayājña* and *ātmayājīn* seem to have undergone a change in course of time. The first occurrence of the term *ātmayājīn* is at ŚB. 11, 2, 6, 13,³⁵ where the *ātmayājīn* is opposed to the *devayājīn*.³⁶ His sacrifice is not a mental rite which replaces the actual performance. Contrary to the *devayājīn* the *ātmayājīn* does not make the gods the aim of his sacrifices. The sacrifice is interpreted as purely *adhyātmam*³⁷ and as producing a new immortal body for the sacrificer. In the compound *ātman* refers to the whole body³⁸ or self rather than to the soul (the principle in the heart which is identified with brahman). Elements of the actually performed³⁹ sacrifice (in this case the New- and Full-moon Sacrifices) are equated with parts of the body and the rite is explained as performed with a view to the sacrificer's self.⁴⁰ Hārīta (quoted by the *Gṛhastharatnākara*, p. 102⁴¹) has a similar twofold division of the sacrificers (*sa dvivīdho dravyeṣṭyāna ātmeṣṭyānaś ca*). Again one and the same śrauta rite seems to allow different approaches or aims.⁴² The conception of the ātman may be different there, but apparently the *ātmeṣṭyāna* like the *ātmayājīn* of ŚB. does not offer the oblation in himself nor perform a mental sacrifice as the substitute of the śrauta rite. In the upaniṣads the term *ātmayājña* only occurs MaiU. 6, 10 (*uttaro vikāro 'syātmayājñasya yathānnam annādaś ca*), where it seems to refer back to the prāṇāgnihotra *ātmayājña* of MaiU. 6, 9.⁴³ So here *ātmayājña* is connected with an actual replacement of the śrauta rite by a sacrifice without external fires. MaiU. 6, 11 (describing the higher modification of the prāṇāgnihotra-bhojanavidhi *ātmayājña* as the eating of the prakṛti by the puruṣa) concludes that "he who knows thus" is *saṁnyāsi yogī cātmayājī ca*. Presumably this means that this (Sāṁkhya) knowledge is equal to yoga, saṁnyāsa and *ātmayājñas* such as the prāṇāgnihotra. This does not imply that the *ātmayājīn* should be a saṁnyāsin, or exclusively a saṁnyāsin. The *ātmayājīn* as a saṁnyāsin occurs BDhŚ. 2, 10, 18, 8 f., where the ascetic offers the food in himself (*ātmany eva juhoti*), that is to say in his internal prāṇa-fires. There the *ātmayājña* seems to be a sacrifice in oneself (*juhoti* with loc. meaning "to offer in") rather than a sacrifice to the personal and

cosmic ātman (*yajati* with loc. in MaiU. 6, 9 meaning "to worship"⁴⁴). This also appears from the description *pañca vā ete 'gnaya ātmasthāḥ . . sa eṣa ātmayājña ātmaniṣṭha ātmapraṭiṣṭha ātmānam kṣemaṁ nayati*. As was observed above this bhojanam of the saṁnyāsin, though being an *ātmayājña*, does not agree with the gṛhastha bhojanam of the śālina and yāyāvara *ātmayājins* (BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 1, the prāṇāgnihotra passage). The VaiSmS. parallel (10, 7) also designates the saṁnyāsin's bhojanam as an *ātmayājña*, but refers back to the prāṇāgnihotra (*prāṇāgnihotraavidhānenātmayājñam saṁkalpya*). The *ātmayājña* appears to be a larger conception than the prāṇāgnihotra. VaiSmS. 5, 8 refers to an *ātmayājīn* who is completely different from the gṛhastha prāṇāgnihotrin: *sarvam ātmani paśyan yatir ātmayājīnas tasya vedāgnir* "The Yati (the religious mendicant, the ascetic), who . . sees (this all) in the Allsoul, to this one, who sacrifices (only) to the Self, belongs the Veda-fire" (tr. Caland, who observes that the translation is uncertain and the meaning not clear). So much is clear that this *ātmayājña*, in which the Veda represents the fire (i.e. the recitation of texts replaces the ritual), is connected with the ātman-brahman speculations and that one should compare this with a passage such as Manu 12, 91.⁴⁵ Manu does not explicitly picture the *ātmayājīn* as a saṁnyāsin. Not every *ātmayājīn* is a *yati*. This was overlooked by Caland in his translation of VaiSmS. 5, 9 *yō vātmayājī snātako 'prāptagrhavrtto mṛtadāro vā mriyeta* "When a (Yati) dies, who sacrifices (alone) to the Ātman, or a Snātaka, who has not reached the mode of life of a householder (viz. who was still unmarried), or one (viz. householder) who had lost his wife by death". The text contains only two *vā's* (and not three). Moreover one may doubt whether every *yati* is cremated and a Totenhochzeit is performed for him. The *ātmayājīn* in this context is the snātaka. This is also confirmed by a comparison with the beginning of 5, 9, where an enumeration of the *āpaddahyas* is given: *snātako vidhuraḥ . . etc.*, and no *yati* is mentioned. Conclusion: the *ātmayājīn* may be a snātaka, who starts his *ātmayājñas* at the samāvartana (see VaiSmS. 2, 18), he may be a saṁnyāsin, but he may also be just a gṛhastha. The lack of (sacred) fires seems to be an essential aspect.

The late twelfth book of MBh. (just as BDhŚ. 2, 10, 18, 8 f. and VaiSmS. 10, 7) connects the *ātmayājña* and the *ātmayājīn* with renunciation; it even prescribes the prāṇāgnihotra exclusively for the ascetics.⁴⁶

NOTES

¹ See ch. III and IX, n. 6.

² *La Mahā Nārāyaṇa Upaniṣad* II (*Étude générale*). See especially p. 43 ff. ("Les Doctrines").

³ "A ce titre, le sacrifice mental (*mānasam yajñam*) prescrit par la M.N.U. et les textes qui lui sont associés apparaît d'abord comme une adaptation nécessaire des rites obligatoires (lustrations, *agnihotra*) aux conditions de l'état de *saṁnyāsin*" (o.c., p. 53). See also I, n. 4.

⁴ "C'est donc d'une forme ancienne du *yoga* qu'il s'agit ici, forme qui n'exclut pas les rites mais bien au contraire leur donne une valeur éminente et libératrice, dans la mesure où ils sont 'spiritualisés' c'est-à-dire pratiqués dans l'esprit (...) Ainsi le Renonçant... pratique-t-il les ablutions prescrites en 'construisant mentalement' un *tīrtha* (point d'eau sacré), il offre les libations en prenant pour substance oblatrice les Mots sacrés: Bhūr! Bhuvah! Suvar! Om! (et non pas, comme il se devrait, du lait ou de l'eau); il médite sur son Ame... il transforme l'obligatoire Oblation au Feu en Oblation aux Souffles..." (o.c., p. 63).

⁵ See Kane, *Hist. of Dharmaś.* II, p. 658; 964 ("They have to perform *śauca*, brushing the teeth, bath, just a house-holders have to do").

⁶ The *Samdhyābhāṣyasamuccaya* (*Ān. S.G.* 40) e.g. contains in the Taitt. *bhāṣyas* besides several verses from TS. and TB. many verses from TĀ. 10 (= MNU.) and even the *Bahvṛcasasamdhyaḥbhāṣyas* quote several mantras which only occur in MNU.

⁷ In this case the MNU. mantrapāṭha combines the evening variants with the morning mantras. See e.g. 321-326.

⁸ ŚāṅkhĀ. 10; ChU. 5, 19 ff., if at least one regards ChU. as an *āraṇyaka*. Varenne (o.c., p. 6) observes: "Nous avons rappelé (...) comment la Chānd-Up. et la B.Ā.U. (qui l'une et l'autre jouent le rôle d'*āraṇyaka*) réservent les pratiques de ce genre à ceux qui résident dans la forêt (*ya ime 'raṇye'*)". We have tried to show (VI D) that the *pañcāgnividyā* passages (to which Varenne refers here) have no relation to the prāṇāgnihotra.

⁹ Observing in his introduction to the TĀ. ed. (*B.I.*, Calcutta 1872), p. 72 "Section LXII lays down certain rules of conduct for observance by *Sannyāsis*" Rajendralal Mitra seems to take all the twelve items as referring to the *saṁnyāsin*'s life. Obviously, however, the *saṁnyāsin*'s way of life, the *nyāsa*, is regarded as superior to ritualism (*yajña*), *tapas*, etc. (the eleven activities which are not particularly connected with *saṁnyāsin*s).

¹⁰ Instead of *parāṁsi* the *āth.* version less correctly reads *tapāṁsi*. Varenne does not mention variants for 538 *tasmān nyāsam eṣāṁ tapasām atiriktam āhuḥ*.

¹¹ *B.I.* ed. of TĀ.

¹² This meaning of *mānasam*, even if it cannot be connected with *yajña*, is of course possible.

¹³ Most of the mantras at least are connected with the *āhnikas*. A thorough study of the ritualistic application in later texts will probably reveal how far this mantrapāṭha is related to the daily rites. The several recensions also play a role here. The mantras for the *apamṛtyuñjayakalpa* (387-413; see VIII, n. 11), i.e. for a rite that is not daily performed, are missing in some recensions.

¹⁴ It represents the bulk of the text to which additional upaniṣads could easily be added (like the *saṁnyāsa upaniṣad* at the end). The name Yājñikī Upaniṣad may with *Sāyaṇa* be taken as referring to the ritualistic framework.

Deussen, however, connects it with the final upaniṣad in which man is represented as a *yajña* (*Sechzig Upanishad's*, p. 241).

¹⁵ I have not found any ritual application of these mantras, but they may have formed the subject of daily *japa* (or *brahmayajña*) in some communities.

¹⁶ See e.g. 270 ff. dedicated to Śiva/Rudra, in which the term *linga* is repeatedly mentioned (in compounds; the connection with the technical term *linga* is uncertain).

¹⁷ MNU. 505-517: *nyāsa* surpasses *satyam*, *tapas*, etc.; 518-542: the same topic in a more extensive version ending before the last subsection, in which life is described as a sacrifice (see VII, n. 8 on this type of *ātmayajña*).

¹⁸ *na karmanā na prajayā dhanena tyāgenaike amṛtatvam ānaśuḥ || pareṇa nākaṁ nihitaṁ guhāyām vibhrājad etad yatayo viśanti || vedāntaviññāna-suniścitārthāḥ || saṁnyāsayogād yatayaḥ śuddhasattvāḥ ||* (227-229). The final upaniṣad obviously glorifies the performer of the *nyāsa*, viz. the *saṁnyāsin*.

¹⁹ ĀpŚS. 5, 3, 22 (see Caland's note to his translation) mentions these two groups of sacrificers in connection with the *agnyādhāna*. There are more references to the *śālinas* and *yāyāvaras* as *āhitāgnis*.

²⁰ Varenne, o.c., p. 82, n. 1 referring to the *yāyāvaras*.

²¹ Cf. chapter III.

²² "Et, de fait, le Vaikh. SmS. est tout entier orienté vers les pratiques des Anachorètes (*vāna-prastha*) et des Renonçants (*saṁnyāsin*) aussi bien dans sa partie '*grhya*' (livres 1 à 7) que dans sa partie '*dharma*' (livres 8 à 10)". This statement is extremely exaggerated. The *grhya sūtra* does not pay much attention to hermits and ascetics. In the *dharma sūtra* the four *āśramas* are treated and often (but not exclusively) the text deals with *vānaprasthas* and *saṁnyāsin*s. One should, however, bear in mind that VaiSmS. is a comparatively late text and that the name *vaikhānasa* does not imply that the complete *smārta sūtra* as it has been transmitted represents a handbook for hermits (who are sometimes called *vaikhānasas*). See K. Rangachari, *Vaikhānasa Dharma Sūtra*, p. XI f. on the existence of an "ancient work, a *Vaikhānasa śāstra* which dealt with the duties of hermits". He holds that "the sections dealing with hermits in *Vai.Dh.Sūtra* are directly adapted from the old work" (p. XXI). Whether BDhŚ., a text which is presumably older than VaiSmS., refers to a lost *Vaikhānasa Śāstra*, is doubtful. See on this point Caland's introduction to his translation of VaiSmS., p. XIX. Anyhow the present VaiSmS. (especially the *grhya* section) does not exclusively refer to hermits.

²³ Indeed several mantras from MNU. occur in VaiSmS. (see Varenne's list of parallels, o.c. II, p. 125), but the ritual of the contexts nowhere excludes the householder.

²⁴ VaiSmS. I, 1 enumerates the contents of the *grhya sūtra*: the sacraments and sacrifices of the householder and to some extent of the hermit, who continues to perform several rites in the forest. In this enumeration only the funeral rites and some *āhnikas* (which are explicitly said to be performed by all the *āśramas*) are left unmentioned. Only 5, 8 (funeral rites) definitely refers to yogins. Note that 1, 8 in dealing with the householder's *agnyāyatana* refers for the hermit's *śrāmaṇaka* fire to the *dharma* section of the *sūtra*.

²⁵ See III, n. 14 and VII, n. 8.

²⁶ See III, n. 14.

²⁷ This sentence has been treated above (p. 300) in the discussion of the ascetic's *bhojana* according to BDhŚ. Cf. n. 21.

²⁸ VaiSmS. 6, 15 states that the householder should perform his daily evening and morning fire-ritual (the *grhya agnihotra*) after *snānam*, *saṁdhyā*

and *brahmayajña* (the ceremonies belonging to all the āśramas) in the marriage-fire. Therefore this rite is also shortly treated VaiSmS. 3, 6 (after the marriage ritual). The oblation consists of rice or agnihotra-material. The gṛhya counterpart of the śrauta agnihotra has like the prāṇāgnihotra lost all connections with the exact moment of sunrise.

²⁹ BDhS., however, does not seem to exclude the Veda-student from the prāṇāgnihotra. See 2, 7, 13, 9: *gṛhastho brahmacārī vā yo 'naśnaṃs tu tapas caret/ prāṇāgnihotralopena avakīrṇi bhavet tu saḥ*. Does VaiSmS. reflect the older situation in which the sacrifice to the breaths still was not just a bhōjanavidhi for all people, old and young, but required as a sacrifice qualified performers, who were as snātakas able to choose for the rest of their life the ātmayajña as their substitute for the śrauta ritual?

³⁰ On these passages see also III, n. 14.

³¹ See e.g. KS. 6, 6: 56. 2 ff. and MS. 1, 8, 7: 127. 2 f.

³² For a new interpretation of the original *samāvartana* see Heesterman, *Pratidānam* (Felic. Vol. Kuiper), p. 436 ff., who makes the turning, on which the name samāvartana is based, refer to the turning round at the end of the chariot race. Manu 7, 82 gives the classical (re-)interpretation of samāvartana as the return from the guru's home: *āvṛttānām gurukulād viprāṇam* . .

³³ VaiSmS. transl., p. 66, n. 10 referring to Caland, *Twee oude fransche Verh. over het Hindoeïsme* (Amsterdam 1923), n. 170. See also Dubois, *Moeurs, institutions et cérémonies des peuples de l'Inde I* (Paris 1825), p. 307 f. One may object to these parallels that the giver of the bride and not the relatives of the future bridegroom try to dissuade him from making a pilgrimage.

³⁴ "Ātmayajña", H.J.A.S. 6, p. 358 ff.

³⁵ *tad āhuḥ/ ātmayājī śreyāzn devayājī ity ātmayājīti ha brūyāt sa ha vā ātmayājī yo vededaṃ me 'nenāṅgaṃ saṃskriyāta idam me 'nenāṅgaṃ upadhīyate iti* "As to this they ask, 'Who is the better one, the self-offerer, or the god-offerer?' Let him say, 'The self-offerer'; for a self-offerer, doubtless, is he who knows, 'This my (new) body is formed by that (body of Yajña, the sacrifice), this my (new) body is procured thereby'" (transl. Eggeling).

³⁶ The *devayājīn* worships the gods by means of the sacrifice (*atha ha sa devayājī yo veda/ devān evāham idam yaje devānt saparyāmiti*, ŚB. 11, 2, 6, 14). The opposition is not between the ātmayājīn as the one who "himself officiates as his own sacrificial priest" and the devayājīn as the one "for whom the sacrifice is performed by another, notably the God (Agni, *devayaj*, ŚB. passim) as missal priest" (Coomaraswamy, o.c., p. 377; see also p. 382).

³⁷ The preceding part of the context deals with the adhyātma interpretation of the sacrifice (11, 1, 6, 29 ff.). For the significance of this adhyātma approach see V. S. Agrawala, "The Vedas and the Adhyātma Tradition", *Indian Culture* 5, p. 285 ff.

³⁸ ŚB. 11, 2, 6, 13 refers to the *anigam* of the sacrificer (see n. 35) and PrāṇU. 33 speaks of a *śarīrayajña* in a passage which may be compared to *ātmayajña* passages in other texts.

³⁹ On the problem of the distinction between the actual performance of the rite with a symbolic interpretation and the replacement by a mental sacrifice see Deussen, *The Philosophy of the Upanishads*, p. 223: "Finally, in many of the instances enumerated it remains doubtful whether it is intended merely to interpret allegorically the still existing sacrificial cult, or to set it aside and replace it by physical and psychical conditions". He concludes that the latter is distinctly the case with the prāṇāgnihotra (which is only correct in that the actual śrauta rite is replaced).

⁴⁰ The sacrifice produces an immortal, sacrificial body for the sacrificer: *idam me 'nenāṅgaṃ saṃskriyāta idam me 'nenāṅgaṃ upadhīyate* (..) *sa rīmāyo yajurmayaḥ sāmāyā āhūtimayaḥ svargaṃ lokam abhisambhavati* (ŚB. 11, 2, 6, 13). Cf. JB. 1, 2 for this transformation of the sacrificer, who becomes immortal. See also JB. 1, 17 f., where the sacrificer produces a second ātman in heaven through his agnihotra.

⁴¹ B.I. 249. I have not been able to trace this quotation from Hārīta.

⁴² The *dravyeyjāna* aims at material results or is deceitful, i.e. he tries to harm somebody by means of his sacrifice (*yo 'sty eva dravyam iti phalam abhisandhāya sopadham vā yajate sa dravyeyjā*). The *ātmejjāna* (the term also occurs MaiU. 6, 9 in the prāṇāgnihotra passage), if I am not mistaken, seems here to be a sacrificer who, like the *dravyeyjāna*, actually performs the śrauta rites, but gives them a different interpretation and has different aims (*atha śrutismṛtyātmanānavān amṛtaṃ havirbhūtādhidaivatam adhyātmabhūtaṃ vaiśvānaraṃ yajati sa ātmejjā*). The *Gṛhastharatnākara* author (p. 103) observes in his commentary *yāga evādhikāri viśeṣeṇa phalaviśeṣa uktāḥ*.

⁴³ See IX, n. 51.

⁴⁴ Van Buitenen translates *ātmann eva yajati* by "worships in the ātman alone" (p. 44) and "sacrifices into the ātman alone" (p. 137). Whatever may be the correct translation (I would prefer: "worships the ātman"), so much is clear that the prāṇāgnihotra passage which directly follows deals with the same ritual as mentioned in the beginning of 6, 9: . . *ātmann evābhidyāyaty ātmann eva yajati*; cf. . . *ātmejjānaḥ prāṇo 'gnir* . . *viśvo 'sīti ca dvābhyām ātmānam abhidhyāyet*.

⁴⁵ *sarvabhūteṣu cātmanāṃ sarvabhūtāni cātmani samam paśyann ātmayājī svārājyam adhigacchati*. For more parallels (IsaU. 6) see Hacker, *Saeculum* 12 (1961), p. 371 ff. The connection with renunciation made by Heesterman, *W.Z.K.S.O.* 8 (1964), p. 23 is doubtful and not confirmed by all contexts.

⁴⁶ MBh. 12, 236, 23 ff. (crit. ed.) *ātmayājī so 'tmaratir ātmakṛdātmasaṃśrayaḥ/ ātmany agnīn samāroṣya tyaktvā sarvaparigrahān/* (..) *sadaiva yājīnām yajñād ātmanījyā nivarate/ triṃś caivāgnīn yajet samyag ātmany evātma-mokṣaṇāt/ prānebhyo yajuṣā pañca ṣaṭ prāśnīyād akutsayan*. Nilakaṇṭha's commentary even refers to the prāṇāgnihotra passage of ChU. See also MBh. 12, 185, 5 *kṛtvā 'gnihotraṃ svaśarīrasaṃstham śarīram agnīm svamukhe juhōti/ yo bhaikṣacaryopagatair havirbhīḥ citāgnīnām sa vyatīyati lokān*.

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE PRĀṆĀGNIHOTRA IN LATER TIMES

The post-Vedic sacrifice to the breaths is a *bhojanavidhi* without special connections with saṃnyāsins or vānaprasthas. For its performance in modern times see C. G. Diehl, *Instrument and Purpose* (Lund 1956), p. 87 f. (dealing with the Vaiṣṇava daily ritual). The prāṇāhuti formulas are as usual *prāṇāya svāhā* etc., here followed by *brahmaṇi ma ātmāmṛtatvāya* (as in MNU.). Diehl's remark (o.c., p. 88) on this bhojanavidhi "A strict observance of these rules will tend to become a rite, the faithful completion of which assures safety and health" is from a historical point of view completely beside the mark. This is not a more or less religious dinner etiquette developing into a rite, but a more than two thousand year old ceremony, which has come to be a strictly observed, but perhaps sometimes no longer understood religious duty at dinner time. See further Mrs. Stevenson's description of the Hindu meal in *The Rites of the Twice-born* (Oxford 1920), p. 242. K. Rangachari's paper "The Sri Vaiṣṇava Brahmans" (*Bull. Madras Govt. Mus.* II, 2) deals with the bhojanam on p. 93 ff. The final formula¹ of the prāṇāhuti is again *brahmaṇi ma ātmāmṛtatvāya* ("Until this time he should be quiet without uttering anything except repeating mantras"²). After dinner one recites *prāṇānām granthir asi* .. (as in BDhŚ. and MNU.) and touches one's chest. Then one pours out water on the right toe with *aṅguṣṭhamātraḥ puruṣo* .. (cf. BDhŚ.; MNU.). Touching the belly one recites the hutānumantras of BDhŚ. *śraddhāyām prāṇe nivīṣya* .. etc. So the prāṇāgni-hotra of BDhŚ. forms the bhojanavidhi of the Sri Vaiṣṇavas in modern times.

A simpler form of this prāṇāgni-hotra bhojanam is found in a Śivaite text from the eleventh century, the Somaśambhupaddhati, which describes the daily ritual of the Śivaïtes in South India. Section 9 in the edition and translation by Mrs. Hélène Brunner-Lachaux (Pondichéry 1963) deals with the bhojanam. The usual Vedic formulas (*amṛtopastaranam asi*; *om prāṇāya svāhā* etc.) recur also in this āgamic context.³ Note the pouring of water on the toe with *ātmā vai dakṣiṇe pāde parāt parataro vibhuḥ | tam aham abhiśiñcāmi yo 'nguṣṭhāgre pratiṣṭhitah* (IX, 23; cf. PrāṇU. 25 mahādevo

'yam puruṣo yo 'nguṣṭhāgre pratiṣṭhitah). At that time the prāṇāgni-hotra just formed the bhojanavidhi of the householder without any special relation with ascetics, as appears from the *Gṛhastharatnākara* by Caṇḍesvara Ṭhakkura (fourteenth century), published in the *B.I.* series. In the bhojanavidhi section (p. 309 ff.) the author refers to several prāṇāgni-hotra passages from earlier texts, which proves that he at least took this rite as connected with householders. The compiler quotes the complete prāṇāgni-hotra passage of BDhŚ.⁴ (p. 318 ff.) and remarks on the *śālinas* and *yāyāvaras* (BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 1 *atha śālinayāyāvarānām ātmayājīnām prāṇāhutiṃ vyākhyāsyāmaḥ*) that the first are *gṛhavāsaśilāḥ gṛhasthāḥ* and the latter *nityam-ātana-svabhāvāḥ sāgnigṛhasthabhedāḥ* ("a subdivision of the householders; people who keeping their fires always wander about"). He even seems to regard the prāṇāgni-hotrin as an *āhitāgni* (p. 322; cf. IV, n. 6). The mantras MNU. 469-472; PrāṇU. 11-13 (*antaś caraṣi* .. etc.) are quoted (p. 317) from Hārīta as belonging to the prāṇāgni-hotra⁵ which forms the brahmin's daily meal (*atha brāhmaṇānām bhojanavidhiṃ vakṣyāmy aham*, p. 316). On the sipping of water before and after the meal see p. 314 f. (quoting Vṛddhaśātā-tapa and Yājñavalkya with regard to the "clothing" of the food).⁶ See p. 317 (referring to a *maitrāyaṇer matam*)⁷ on touching the heart or chest with *prāṇānām granthir asi* .. (MNU. 498; BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 10). Most interesting is a parallel of the prāṇāgni-hotra passage in ChU. which is ascribed to Viṣṇu.⁸ (p. 315 f.). The prāṇāgni-hotra passage of BDhŚ. is also quoted by the *Smṛticandrikā* II, *Āhnikakāṇḍa* (ed. L. Srinivasacharya, Mysore 1914), p. 605 f.⁹ (in the bhojana section) and by Mādhavācharya's elaborate commentary on the *Parāśarasmr̥ti* (*B.I.* ed.) Vol. I, p. 368 f. (commenting on 1, 59 which deals with the bhojanam).¹⁰ Both texts also mention Śaunaka's treatment of the prāṇāhuti in this connection.¹¹ The latter, moreover, quotes (p. 368 and 379) the KūrmP. version of the prāṇāgni-hotra.¹² KūrmP. 2, 19 describes the bhojanam in the context of the daily duties of the brahmin (2, 18, 1 *ahany ahani kartavyam brāhmaṇānām mahāmune tad ācaksva* ..). The whole context refers to the duties of the householder as is rightly observed in the preface of the *B.I.* ed., p. XXXIII. The parallelism with the prāṇāgni-hotra of BDhŚ. is striking (but the prāṇāhuti formulas are *om prāṇāya svāhā* etc.). Note e.g. the hutānumantraṇam, which in the *B.I.* ed. of the purāṇa is evidently corrupt.¹³ Compare also BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 15 *sarva-kratuyājīnām ātmayājī viśiṣyate* with KūrmP. 2, 19, 13 *sarveṣām*

eva yogānām (yāgānām?) ātmayogah (ātmayāgah?) smṛtaḥ paraḥ (B.I. ed.) | *sarveśām evam aṅgānām (eva yāgānām?) ātmayāgah paraḥ smṛtaḥ* (Parāśaramādhava, p. 379 quoting KūrmP.). The heart is touched with the usual mantra *prāṇānām granthir asi* .. and water is poured on the right toe: *ācamyāṅguṣṭhamātreṇa* (i.e. with the mantra *āṅguṣṭhamātraḥ puruṣo* .. etc.; BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 11?) *pādāṅguṣṭhena dakṣiṇe niśrāvayet*.¹⁴

Unfortunately I was not able to trace the interesting prāṇāgni-hotra passage (*athātaḥ prāṇāhutikalpo* ..) which Parāśaramādhava (p. 367) as well as the *Smṛticandrikā* (p. 606 f.) ascribe to Gobhila.¹⁵ Vṛddha-Hārīta Sm. 8, 257 ff. (ed. *smṛtīnām samuccaya*) deal with the prāṇāgni-hotra as the householder's bhojanam. The ceremony is clearly vaiṣṇavite. The performer sprinkles the food (reciting i.a. the *gāyatri*¹⁶), meditates on the food (*annarūpaṃ virāṭpuruṣaṃ dhyātvā*) and on Viṣṇu (*dhyātvā hr̥tphaṇkaje viṣṇum*). After the formula *amṛtopastaraṇam asi* has been recited one should offer the five prāṇāhutis to the *prāṇāḥ* and at the same time to Hari: *uddiśyaiva harim̐ prāṇāṃ juhuyāt saghṛtīm haviḥ* (261) .. *pañcaprāṇādyāhutayo mantraiḥ tair juhuyād dhareḥ* (262). The prāṇāhuti formulas are *śraddāyām prāṇe niviṣṭaḥ* etc.¹⁷ The same text describes the prāṇāgni-hotra as one of the forms of pūjā: *apsv agnau hṛdaye sūrye sthaṇḍile pratimāsu ca | ṣaṭsu teṣu hareḥ pūjā nityam eva viśeṣataḥ* (8, 91-92); *prāṇāgni-hotrasamaye samyag ācamya vāriṇā | .. prāṇāyāmaṃ samācāret | mantreṇodbudhya hṛdaye .. tasmin vahny arkaśītāṃśu-bimbāny anuvicintayet | .. tanmadhye 'ṣṭādalaṃ padmaṃ dhyāyet .. | vīrāsane samāśinaṃ tasminn īśaṃ vicintayet | .. jānakīlakṣmaṇope-taṃ manasaivārcayed vibhum | mantradvayenārcayitvā japtvā caiva ṣaḍakṣaram | paścād vai juhuyāt pañca prāṇān abhyarcya taṃ punaḥ | dhyāyan vai manasā viṣṇum sukhaṃ bhuñjīta vāgyataḥ | evaṃ hṛdy arcaṇaṃ viṣṇor uttamaṃ munisattamāḥ | atyantābhi-matā viṣṇor hr̥tphūjā paramātmanāḥ* (8, 98-107). So the pūjā in the heart is here the prāṇāgni-hotra.¹⁸ This prāṇāgni-hotra is not basically different from the bhojanavidhi of 8, 257 ff., where the ritualistic aspect is more stressed. Here, however, the meditation receives more attention. Apparently these different forms of pūjā do not exclude each other and there is no reason for assuming that the prāṇāgni-hotra-pūjā is exclusively prescribed for samnyāsins. Uśanā Samhitā 3, 98 ff. (only accessible for me in the translation of M. N. Dutt, *The Dharmaśāstra or Hindu Law Codes I*, Calc. 1908, p. 189 ff.), obviously referring to the householder's bhojanam, mentions as formulas

amṛtopastaraṇam (amṛtāpidhānam) asi and the prāṇāhutis (followed by an offering to the self: "Then understanding their true import, a twice-born one should offer oblation to his own self"). Partaking of the remains of one's meal one should meditate on Prajāpati (as is prescribed by BDhŚ.). The breast is touched with *prāṇānām granthir asi* and water poured on the toe (apparently without a mantra). The conclusion (3, 106) runs that of all the *yāgas* the *ātmayāga* is the foremost.¹⁹ Among the smṛtis see also Laghvāś-valāyana 1, 154²⁰ and Vyāsa 3, 70²¹, where the householder's bhojanam (with prāṇāhutis) is treated.

All the passages so far dealt with give the picture of a prāṇāgni-hotra which forms the bhojanam of *gr̥hasthas* and presumably others, at least not exclusively of hermits and ascetics. The latter also perform the prāṇāhuti in connection with their bhojanam, as appears from MārkaP. 41, 13 ff. (in a section which describes the yogin's religious course): *apaḥ pūrvam sakṛt prāśya tūṣṇīm bhūtvā samāhitāḥ | prāṇāyeti tatas tasya prathamā hy āhutiḥ smṛtā* .. (etc. with *apānāya* and the other breaths) .. *apaḥ punaḥ sakṛt prāśya ācamya hṛdayaṃ spr̥śet*. The yogin should beg his food from *gr̥hasthas* and *yāyāvaras*.²² See also X, n. 46.

That, however, the sacrifice to the breaths mostly does not have any special relation to ascetics is illustrated by the fact that a text like the *Yatidharmasaṃgraha* in its sections on the samnyāsins' daily life and ceremonies hardly deals with the prāṇāgni-hotra. Once or twice a prāṇāhuti occurs in the context of a bhojanam, but nowhere an elaborate prāṇāgni-hotra passage is quoted. The passage *prapañcam akhilaṃ yas tu jñānāgnau juhuyād yatih | ātmany agnau samāropya so 'gni-hotri na cetarah* (occurring on p. 27 and 154 of the *Ān.S.G.* ed.) probably does not refer to the prāṇāgni-hotra, but may be connected with other symbolic "sacrifices" such as the speaking of truth etc., which are mostly equated with the (lifelong) agni-hotra. Kane, *Hist. of Dharmaś.* II, p. 917 ff. dealing with the vānaprasthas and samnyāsins does not mention the prāṇāgni-hotra and only examines this rite in the chapter on the bhojanam (p. 757 ff.), which belongs to the *āhnikas* ("Under this section we are concerned principally with the duties of the *snātaka* .. and the *gr̥hastha* .." — Kane, o.c., p. 640). See especially p. 763 f. Kane rightly observes (p. 763): "All this has been prescribed from very ancient times and has continued to this day". I have tried to show in the preceding chapter that in the ritualistic prāṇāgni-hotra passages (BDhŚ.;

VaiSmS. and in a way MNU.) the performers of the rite should be primarily taken as householders. The post-Vedic texts, which mostly describe the rite as a bhojanavidhi and sometimes as a pūjā,²³ confirm this view. The Śiva Upaniṣad seems to connect the rite with yogins.²⁴ In view of the copious other material, however, one may speak of a continuity. Varenne has only quoted two late Vedic ritual handbooks, a dharmasāstra²⁵ (BDhŚ.) and a gṛhyasūtra (VaiSmS.), overlooking the late Āgniveśya gṛhyasūtra and ĀsvGPar. At ĀgnGS. 2, 6, 7 the bhojanam is described (*daivavihitām pūjām kṛtvā gomayena gocarmamātram caturaśram sthaṇḍilam upalīpya kṣatriyasya trikoṇam upalīpya vaiśyasya vṛttam upalīpya bhojanam kurute*). Beside some usual prāṇāgnihotra mantras and formulas²⁶ one may especially note the prāṇāhuti formulas *prāṇe niviṣṭo 'mṛtaṁ juhomī śivo mā viśāpradāhāya prāṇāya svāhā, apāne niviṣṭo* . . etc. (= BDhŚ.). The conclusion of this passage runs *evam bhojane bhojane kurvan (aho)rātropavāsaphalam aśnute*. The emendation or conjecture of the editor (L. A. Ravi Varma, *Agniveśyagṛhyasūtra*, Trivandrum 1940) should perhaps be corrected. See *Smṛticandrikā*, p. 603 and *Gṛhastharatnākara*, p. 311 (quoting Vyāsa) *bhūmau pātram pratiṣṭhāpya yo bhūṅkte vāgyataḥ śuciḥ | bhojane bhojane caiva trirātraphalam aśnute*. Cf. also KūrmP. 2, 19, 3 *pañcārthro bhojanam kuryād bhūmau pātram nidhāya ca | upavāsena tat tulyam manur āha prajāpatiḥ*. Remarkably ĀsvGPar. 2, 11 concludes its description of the prāṇāgnihotra bhojanam (*atha bhojanavidhir . .*) with the statement *evam bhuñjāno 'gnihoṭraphalam*²⁷ *aśnute*. The usual prāṇāgnihotra formulas are found in this bhojanavidhi, which has no relation to hermits or samnyāsins. In 1964 K. Parameswara Aithal, who regards ĀsvGPar. as no more than a prayoga or paddhati, published a different Āśvalāyana Parīṣiṣṭa which also contains a bhojanavidhi (ĀśvP. 23). It shows agreements with PrāṇU. 23 and 25 and with ChU. 5, 24, 1 and 3, but has no references to the performers.

NOTES

¹ The prāṇāhuti formulas are here also simply *prāṇāya svāhā* etc. Further note the formula *amṛtopastaraṇam asi*.

² So apparently the mantras are not recited silently, as Varenne (o.c., p. 112 f., n. 10) assumes in the case of PrāṇU.

³ Note *uddīpyodarāṇalam* " . . dans le feu de l'estomac ravivé par HETI". Before sipping water with *amṛtopastaraṇam asi* one pours water on rice, which is thrown down, with a formula dedicated to the five secondary *prāṇāḥ*. The

Jānaratanāvalī, quoted o.c., p. 305, states that the ātman, the bhūtayonis, the gods, pitṛs and nāgas are established in the five *prāṇāḥ* and that *ekai-kāhutibhir . . tarpayed imān gṛhṭavyaṇjanasammiśram śeṣam iśāya homayet*.

⁴ The quotation does not completely agree with the text as reproduced by Varenne (Hultzs' first ed.) and with Hultzs' second edition (*Abh. K.M.* 16, 2). It reads . . *iti pañcabhir brahmaṇi sa* (read *ma*) *ātmā amṛtatvāyety akṣareṇātmani yojayet*, whereas BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 12-14 has . . *ity ātmānam akṣareṇa cātmānam yojayet* (the second ed. omits *ātmānam*). This is explained (o.c., p. 321): *brahmaṇi sa* (read *ma*) *ātmā amṛtatvāyety, anena mantrenākṣareṇa parabrahmaṇā ātmānam jivam yojayet, ekatvena dhyāyedy arthaḥ*. Varenne (referring to MNU. 540 *om ity ātmānam yuñjita*) is probably right in taking *akṣareṇa* as "by means of the syllable *om*" against Bühler, who agrees with the interpretation furnished by the *Gṛhastharatnākara*. Cf. also MaiU. 6, 3 *etat vā āditya om iti dhyāyams tathātmānam yuñjita* (the text is corrupt, see van Buitenen, p. 135, n. 44).

⁵ They directly precede *amṛtopastaraṇam asi* and *prāṇāya svāhā*. The passage is not found in the Hārīta Sm. as published in *aṣṭādaśa smṛtayaḥ* (Bombay 1908).

⁶ The food does not become naked (*bhavaty annam anagmam*; YājñSm. 1, 106 *anagmam . . kāryam annam*). Cf. IX, n. 17. For the passage from YājñSm. see H. Losch, *Die Yājñavalkyasmṛti* (Leipzig 1927), p. 12 mentioning a verse from the parallel version of GarP. (96, 17): *prāṇāgnihomavidhināśnīyād . .* From the context appears that the performer is a householder.

⁷ Source unknown.

⁸ Unfortunately not to be traced in ViṣṇP. The correspondence with the ChU. prāṇāgnihotra (see ch. IX A) is striking. The breaths are included in the *trpti*-classification. The unusual order of these *prāṇāḥ* is the same as in ChU. Several items have been replaced by synonyms: *arka* for *āditya*, *kakubhaḥ* for *diśaḥ*, *bhūmi* (thus one ms.) for *prthivī*; several are identical. The phrase found in ChU. *tasyānu trptim trpyati prajāyā paśubhir annādyena tejasā brahmavarcasena* is paraphrased thus: *prajādhyo brahmācārī syāt paśuvannair vardhate ca saḥ | prāṇāgnihoṭravid vipro dātā ca syāt samyaddhimān*. The quotation concludes with *bhuktvāmṛtāpīdhānārtham pibet toyam sakṛt sakṛt | yenānnaṁ na bhaven nagnaṁ jivadbhūtam jagattraye | evam bhuñjan sadā vipro jñātiprādhānyam āpnuyāt*. The last sentence seems to suit the *mantha* rite more (in the context of which the reaching of superiority plays a role). This parallel of the prāṇāgnihotra as found in ChU. clearly points to the householder as the performer of the rite. The *āpośānam* with *amṛtopastaraṇam* (*amṛtāpīdhānam*) *asi* is connected with an explanation of the sipping of water which is the same as given by ChU. and BĀU. (cf. IX, n. 17). Remarkably the food (and not the prāṇa) becomes *anagna* here (cf. IX, n. 28).

⁹ The quotation reads *ity akṣareṇātmanā yojayet* (cf. n. 4).

¹⁰ One of the differences with the text as edited by Hultzs is the addition of *śraddhāyām* before the formulas *prāṇe* (resp. *apāne* etc.) *niviṣṭo* . . (as in MNU. 480 ff.). It further reads *ity ātmānam yojayet* (cf. n. 4 and 9).

¹¹ *Smṛtic.*, p. 607 and *Parāśaramādhava*, p. 367 f. (espec. dealing with the use of the fingers in the prāṇāhuti).

¹² The term *prāṇāgnihotra* is not used by the purāṇa, but all the elements of the sacrifice to the breaths as described by BDhŚ. occur in this passage on the bhojanam. Note that *Parāśaramādhava* (p. 368) after quoting KūrmP. 2, 19, 5 (on drinking water before eating) continues: *baudhāyanas tu sarvam etat samgrhyāha* (follows the quotation of the prāṇāgnihotra passage from BDhŚ.).

¹³ KūrmP. 2, 19, 11-12 (B.I. ed) .. *ūrdhvahastaḥ samāhitah*/(to be taken with the following sentence, as appears from BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 12 *hutānumantraṇam ūrdhvahastaḥ samācayet/śraddhāyām prāṇe nivīṣya* ..) *kṛtānumantraṇam kuryāt sandhyāyām iti mantrataḥ* (Parāśaramādhava *hutānumantraṇam kuryāt śraddhāyām iti mantrataḥ*). Also compare KūrmP. 2, 19, 12 *atha mantreṇa svātmānam yojayed brāhmaṇeti hi* (v. 1. *athākṣareṇa* ..; Mādhava: *aṣṭākṣareṇa hy ātmānam yojayed brahmaṇīti hi*, in which *aṣṭākṣareṇa* is wrong, but *brahmaṇīti* correct) with BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 13 f. *brahmaṇi ma ātmāmṛtatvāyety ātmānam akṣareṇa cātmānam yojayet* (or .. *iti/akṣareṇa cātmānam* ..; see n. 4, 9 and 10 and VII, n. 9; VIII, n. 2).

¹⁴ Thus reads the B.I. edition. The Parāśaramādhava quotation has *ācamyāṅguṣṭham āniya pādāṅguṣṭhe tu dakṣiṇe niśāvayet*.

¹⁵ The following mantras may be noted: *antaś carasi bhūteṣu* .. (MNU.; PrāṇU.); *amṛtopastaraṇam asi*; the *daśahotr* formula; *prāṇāya svāhā (gārha-patyam etena juhōti)*; *apāṇāya svāhā (anvāhāryapacanam etena juhōti)* .. etc. Apparently the five prāṇāhutis are equated with five offerings in the five sacred fires. The prāṇāhutikalpa starts with *vyāhṛtibhir gāyatrīyābhimantrīya*. Compare MaiU. 6, 2, where van Buitenen (*The Maitr. Up.*, p. 39) unconvincedly connects the gāyatrī/sāvitrī and the vyāhṛtis with the agnihotra and agnyādhāna instead of the prāṇāgnihotra. See IX, n. 49.

¹⁶ Cf. the preceding note and IX, n. 49. See also n. 20.

¹⁷ *śraddhāyām prāṇe nivīṣṭeti* (wrong sandhi) *mantrēṇa yathākramam/ta-rjanimādhyamāṅguṣṭhaiḥ prāṇāyēti yajed dhaviḥ* (8, 263) .. etc. with an accurate description of the use of the fingers for each prāṇāhuti. After the last prāṇāhuti the text continues: *ayam agnir vaiśvānarir (?) ity ātmānam (sc. yajed?) Cf. the difficult ellipse ity ātmānam BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 13) ananīaram/śatam aṣṭottaram mantram manasaiva jāpet tataḥ/dhyāyēn nārāyaṇam devaṃ bhojanam tu yathākramam* .. (8, 266 f.).

¹⁸ These forms of pūjā occur together in other texts (see Kane, *Hist. of Dharmaś.* II, p. 715 and also ĀgnGS. 2, 4, 10; BGParS. 2, 22, 8; ĀśvGParS. 2, 10), but the *hṛtpūjā* does not always seem to be a prāṇāgnihotra-bhojanavidhi. God is worshipped in the heart by meditation (*dhyāna*) according to Rgvidh. 3, 42, 3 (see also Kane, l.c.). This text, moreover, connects the *hṛtpūjā* with yogins, whereas other texts (such as ĀśvGParS.) apparently take all performers as householders. Here we touch upon the problem of the mental sacrifice or mental pūjā and its performer. According to BGParS. 2, 22, 8 (where the worship *jale vā sthaṇḍile vā pratimāsu vā* is treated) one should worship mentally (*manasā*) in case the material or the place where the oblatory material should be offered are missing (*deśābhāve dravyābhāve*). Compare Śivopaniṣad 4, 58, where the substitutes for the ghee-oblation and for the fire in the daily *śivāgnihotra* are enumerated. Instead of fire one may use water, earth, the brahmin's right hand, kuśa-grass, aśvattha-wood, the right ear of a goat (cf. also ṢaḍvB. 4, 12, tr. Bollée with note): *svātmāgnau homayet prājñāḥ sarvāgninām asaṃbhāve/abhāve na tyajet karma karmayogavidhau sthitaḥ/āpatkāle 'pi yah kuryāc chivāgner manasārcanam/sa mohakañcu-kam tyaktvā parām śāntim avāpnuyāt/| prāṇāgnihotram kurvanti paramam śivayogināḥ/bāhyakarmavinirmuktā jñānadhyānasamākulāḥ* (ŚivU. 4, 65 ff.). Here the incidental, expiatory mental sacrifice is combined with the regular non-external worship. Now it should be noted that the prāṇāgnihotra is not a purely mental rite. On the one hand it is a substitute of the agnihotra in which the actual fires are replaced by internal fires in and to which is offered, without being a really mental agnihotra (see ch. IV). On the other hand the bhojanam is sometimes regarded as the worship of the supreme god in the

heart-lotus of the sacrificer, i.e. the deity rather than the sacrificial fire is interiorized. The worship is only mental as far as the meditation on the deity is concerned; the god is not actually visible like the image in the outer worship. The oblation itself and the ritualism of the bhojanavidhi-prāṇāgnihotra is far from mental. In the purely mental pūjā (for literature on this subject see T. Goudriaan, "Vaikhānasa Daily Worship", *I.I.J.* 12 (1970), p. 209) even the food is given to the deity only in thought. On the *naivedyam*, which in outer worship is accompanied with the prāṇāhuti formulas, see VIII, n. 20. The prāṇāgnihotra as a pūjā of the interior deity does not seem to be exclusively connected with yogins and saṃnyāsins. The aspect of interiorization may have been popular with the less ritualistic circles. In the same way as the prāṇāgnihotra "sacrifice" forms a stage intermediate between the actual agnihotra sacrifice and the mental rite, the prāṇāgnihotra as a pūjā is different from the actual, "outer" pūjā as well as from the purely mental pūjā.

¹⁹ Cf. BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 15 and KūrmP. 2, 19, 13 (see above).

²⁰ Note the *abhimantraṇam* of the food with the *gāyatrī* (cf. n. 15). See also the Keśavavaijayanī commentary by Nandapaṇḍita on the ViṣṇSm. (*Adyar Libr. Ser.*, 1893) for this sprinkling of the food with the *gāyatrī* (and the *vyāhṛtis*). The commentary on 68, 42-45 describes a bhojanavidhi with several prāṇāgnihotra features.

²¹ In the ed. *smṛtīnām samuccayaḥ* 3, 70; in the translation of M. N. Dutt (*The Dharma Śāstra or Hindu Law Codes*, p. 523 f.) 3, 66. The context in this *smṛti* and the one mentioned before refers to householders.

²² MārK. 41, 8 *bhaiṣyaṇ cared grhasṭheṣu yāyāvaragrheṣu ca*. Pargiter translates "... and at the houses of vagrant mendicants", which hardly can be correct, vagrant mendicants not having houses and begging from beggars being odd. The *yāyāvaras* are obviously a subdivision of the *grhasṭhas*. See the discussion of BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12 in the preceding chapter. On receiving alms from *yāyāvaras* see BDhŚ. 4, 5, 27, where these *yāyāvaras* take in a position intermediate between agnihottrins and hermits.

²³ See n. 18. For a tantric prāṇāgnihotra see the Appendix.

²⁴ See n. 18.

²⁵ I do not enter here into the question how far the Baudhāyana *smṛti* should be taken as a śāstra or as a sūtra. See Hultzs' second edition, p. X, where he decides in favour of the title *Dharmasūtra*.

²⁶ E.g. *amṛtopastaraṇam asi*; *amṛtāpidhānam asi*; *prāṇāya svāhā* etc. (mentioned as optional beside *prāṇe nivīṣṭo* etc.); *prāṇānam granthir asi*. Note again the use of the *gāyatrī* (*prāṇavavyāhṛtipūrvayā sāvitryābhyukṣya*).

²⁷ Remarkably Mādhava's commentary on ParāśSm. (B.I. ed., vol. I, p. 377) mentions the obtainment of a *prāṇāgnihotrāphala* in the bhojana: *yo vāmapādakaro bhukte yaś ca sthito bhukte taiḥ sarvair yad bhuktaṃ tad rakṣāṃsi bhuñjate na svayaṃ prāṇāgnihotrādiphalaṃ prāpnotīty arthaḥ*.

CHAPTER TWELVE

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The *prāṇāgnihotra* is a *bhojanam* ceremony in which food is offered as an oblation to the breaths (*prāṇāya svāhā* etc.) representing the sacred fires.¹ This *prāṇāhuti*,² the central element of the *prāṇāgnihotra* ritual,³ forms the regular introduction to the orthodox Hindu meal. The first elaborate description of the *prāṇāgnihotra*, which occurs in BDhŚ.,⁴ is not restricted to the *prāṇāhuti* as such, but also deals with actions to be performed and formulas to be recited before and after the meal. Most of this can be found in descriptions of the *bhojanavidhi* in the (late) dharma literature.⁵

The existence of sufficient evidence that the *prāṇāgnihotra* is a specific rite with specific actions and formulas has not prevented scholars from applying this term to all kinds of symbolic or mental sacrifices.⁶ One should bear in mind that the *prāṇāgnihotra* is only one of the symbolic substitutes of the *agnihotra*⁷ and that "sacrifices" in which the *prāṇa* plays a role are not necessarily connected with the *agnihotra*.⁸ Establishing the connection with the *agnihotra*, i.e. explaining why and how the *prāṇāgnihotra* developed from this *śrauta* rite rather than from another, is one of the principal aims of this study.

The *prāṇāgnihotra-bhojanavidhi*, as a ritual simplification of the *agnihotra*, may be compared to the *grhya* version which more and more takes over the *śrauta* *agnihotra* of the far from numerous *āhitāgnis*. Moreover the *agnihotra* itself is regarded as a substitute for all kinds of more elaborate *śrauta* sacrifices and the *prāṇāgnihotra* may be said to continue the "deritualizing" trend of the *agnihotra* itself. The fire-offering is the simplest and most popular *śrauta* rite; the term *agnihotrin* is almost identical to *āhitāgni*. Its comparative simplicity may have attracted the meta-ritualists among whom the *kṣatriyas* (who were excluded themselves from the *agnihotra*) played an important role. Moreover several features of the *agnihotra* offered good starting-points for microcosmic and macrocosmic interpretations.⁹ There is a parallel between sunset and sunrise, the milking of the cow twice a day, and the two *bhojanas*. The more or less esoteric interpretations of the *agnihotra* by some *kṣatriyas* are most-

ly found in passages which contain the motif of *kṣatriya*-overtrumps-brahmin, whereas the contents of the new doctrine are often not wholly new. This motif proves at least that in the period of the late *brāhmaṇas* and early *upaniṣads* the *kṣatriyas* gained influence in speculative thought. Since we are to some extent concerned with a mere theme, there is no reason for assuming an essentially *kṣatriya* influence in the development of the *prāṇāgnihotra*. In ChU. 5, 19 ff., where a *kṣatriya* teaches this sacrifice to some brahmins, it forms an evident addition to a more original version without the *prāṇāgnihotra* passage.¹⁰ On the other hand there is no denying that already in the oldest sources it is the feeding of brahmins which forms the *kṣatriya*'s substitute for the *agnihotra* and that some passages dealing with this sacrifice performed in the person of a brahmin have *ātmayajña* aspects which are reminiscent of the *prāṇāgnihotra* contexts.¹¹

The usual symbolism of the *agnihotra*¹² may to some extent recur in the *prāṇāgnihotra*, but there are elements which probably do not derive directly from the *brāhmaṇas* dealing with the *agnihotra*. The very current *prāṇa* speculations (*prāṇa* = *ātman*; *ātman* = brahman) seem to have played a role as well. The micro-macrocosmic aspect (*ātman*-brahman), which in the speculations on the *agnihotra* was hardly discernible, made its appearance as soon as the rite became interiorized. The *śrauta* sacrifice became an *ātmayajña*¹³ through the *adhyaत्मam* interpretation. This phenomenon was not restricted to the sphere of the *agnihotra* but found a particularly fertile soil for the development of an interiorized rite in the context of that rite (in which the identification of the fires and the *prāṇāh* was very current). The connection between the fires and the sacrificer (especially his life, i.e. *prāṇāh*) may have been a rather old concept.¹⁴

The aspect of alternation which is so important in connection with the *agnihotra* speculations (sunset-sunrise; inhalation-exhalation) hardly plays a role in the *prāṇāgnihotra*.¹⁵ Much more important are the *agnihotra* speculations on the identification of fires and *prāṇāh*, which in fact has no relation to this twofold aspect of the *agnihotra* and the exact moment of its performance (about sunrise and sunset). The lifelong (*jarāmaryam*)¹⁶ observance of the *agnihotra* rather than the single performance is essential in this interpretation which homologizes fires and *prāṇāh*, *agnihotra* and life.

These *prāṇāh* (mostly breaths, but sometimes vital powers) are

especially identified with the fires in the context of the *agnyādhāna*,¹⁷ which represents the sacrificer's birth.¹⁸ The *āhitāgni* remains connected with his fires until death and cremation (his last agnihotra, which, in some respects, corresponds to the *agnyādhāna*). The agnihotra is his life; the daily oblations maintain his life, are food for his *prāṇāḥ*.¹⁹ It is only a small step from this interpretation of the actually performed agnihotra to its substitute, the *prāṇāgnihotra*. Since in this concept of the agnihotra the fires-*prāṇāḥ* are no longer instruments for conveying the oblation, but form the object of the rite themselves, one may regard the *prāṇāgnihotra* as a sacrifice to the breaths rather than an offering into the breaths-fires.

The identification of *prāṇāḥ* and fires in the context of the agnihotra not only occurs in (late) esoteric, *adhyātman* interpretations of the sacrifice, but also in ritual passages, especially in the expiations.²⁰ Some passages dealing with expiations, however, have a less ritualistic signification and seem to indicate the tendency to present esoteric doctrines and practices under the guise of an expiation, especially in the context of the *brahmodya*.²¹ In this connection the debate of ŚB. 11, 5, 3, 8 ff.²² on the extinction of the fires is interesting. One is ultimately advised by Uddālaka to drink the oblation oneself, i.e. to offer it into oneself (the brahmin = brahman = Prāṇa = all the *prāṇāḥ*-fires). GB. 1, 3, 13 ff., borrowing this passage from ŚB., adds an appendix which may refer to the *prāṇāgnihotra* and has close parallels in ChU. and ŚāṅkhĀ. which (at least in the case of ChU.) definitely deal with the sacrifice to the breaths.²³ The offering into oneself is connected with a "cosmification"²⁴ of the performer in GB. and the parallels. In the version of ŚāṅkhĀ. the relation to the actual *prāṇāgnihotra* rite with its five *prāṇāhuti*s is disturbed by the introduction of a sixth *prāṇa* (vital power).²⁵ Moreover that passage seems to consist of some disconnected elements (e.g. a sacrifice in which the oblation is different from food) which hardly belong to the *prāṇāgnihotra*. The version of ChU. combines the "cosmification" of GB. with an Ātman Vaiśvānara theory (taken from ŚB.) and the actual practice of the fivefold *prāṇāhuti*. Traces of this secondary combination are discernible in the text.²⁶

One of the current misconceptions about the *prāṇāgnihotra* is that it represents a mental sacrifice.²⁷ The oblation is concrete and so are the ritual actions.²⁸ Pouring water on the toe at the end of the *bhojanavidhi* (which is found in many *prāṇāgnihotra* passages) can

hardly be called a mental action. The ceremony remains purely ritualistic; only the aim and outlook have changed. The so-called mental sacrifice may be either the performance in thought of an existing rite (with all minute details) or the identification of a particular way of life (speaking the truth; practising *ahimsā*, etc.) with sacrifice in general (or even with a particular rite).²⁹ The observation of a way of life without adhering to particular rules coinciding with the actual performance of the śrauta rite is sometimes mentioned in the *prāṇāgnihotra* context. A true mental sacrifice is found in the substitute of the agnihotra during the *pravāsa*.

Intermediate between the *pravāsāgnihotra* in which the whole rite is mentally performed at the prescribed time.³⁰ and the actual agnihotra is the position of the rite carried out by the old, decrepit agnihotrin as described at BŚS. 29, 5: 376, 3 ff.³¹ The old agnihotrin (not depicted as a *saṃnyāsin*) offers the oblation (i.e. the agnihotramilk and not whatever food there may be) into himself, but tries to conform his rite to the actual agnihotra by reciting the same formulas and imitating the offering of the two oblations.³² The *prāṇāhuti* is still missing, but the first elaborate passage dealing with the ritualism of the *prāṇāgnihotra* in BDhŚ. is obviously influenced by this passage occurring in BŚS.³³

Baudhāyaṇa's dharma text replaces the first oblation (= draught of milk in BŚS.) by the fivefold *prāṇāhuti* and the second by the *bhojanam* itself, but retains some aspects of its śrauta source. For the *prāṇāhuti*s this most important *prāṇāgnihotra* passage could draw from older sources (such as ChU.), but the extension of the formulas may be based on śrāddha texts, among which BGS. shows some striking verbal correspondences.³⁴ The *prāṇāgnihotra* formulas in late śrāddha passages may derive from the sacrifice to the breaths since every *bhojanam* could ultimately be connected with the *prāṇāhuti*s,³⁵ but in the case of the old śrāddha passages such as BGS. 2, 11, 38 the situation seems to be different. There are indications that some *prāṇāgnihotra* mantras which occur for the first time in BDhŚ. and MNU. are based on the śrāddha ritual.³⁶ The *āpośānam* formulas recited before the *prāṇāhuti* and at the end of the *bhojanam* may have their origin in the *madhuparka*.³⁷

Some scholars incorrectly connect certain passages with the *prāṇāgnihotra*. The identification of the *bhojanam* with the agnihotra in the context of a "water doctrine"³⁸ is most significant. Contrary to the "conservative" or "static" agnihotra of the *prāṇāgnihotra* and

its starting-points (in which the oblation maintains the *prāṇāh*-fires) this agnihotra-bhojanam may be called "productive" or "creative". Like the shedding of seed (produced by food) it forms a link in the chain of a water cycle which produces new life. This theory is especially found in the *pañcāgnividyā*.³⁹

An examination of all the microcosmic and macrocosmic interpretations of the agnihotra found in the Vedic prose texts⁴⁰ makes clear why a symbolic substitute of a sacrifice could find favourable conditions for development out of the agnihotra.⁴¹ These interpretations themselves can, however, hardly be connected with the *prāṇāgnihotra*.⁴²

Several upaniṣadic or upaniṣad-like passages which had been associated with the *prāṇāgnihotra* by Varenne are examined fully.⁴³ Some of them have no relation to that rite.⁴⁴ Another point dealt with is the position of the *prāṇāgnihotra* in MaiU. which seems to have been underestimated by van Buitenen.⁴⁵ His reconstruction of the original MaiU, is in my opinion not open to criticism, but the assumption that the agnihotra and related rites form the context in which this upaniṣad unfolds its doctrine is not tenable in all respects. In order to prove this view a detailed discussion of all the relevant ritualistic passages in MaiU. is inserted. The *prāṇāgnihotra* turns out to be a central theme, especially in the sections 6, 1 ff., in which a twofold homology of *prāṇa* and *āditya*, rather than a threefold one with fire as the third item, plays a role. The *agnicayana* referred to in MaiU. 1, 1 and 6, 33 seems to be neither the actual rite, nor the *agnyādhāna* described in terms of the *agnicayana* (van Buitenen's assumption). Apparently the intention of the text is a symbolic or perhaps a mental *agnicayana*, i.e. a substitute for the actual śrauta rite, just as the *prāṇāgnihotra* replaces the agnihotra in this text. The actual ritualism is not condemned and the agnihotra may be involved in some speculations of the text, but the most important theme is the twofold or threefold homology of *prāṇa*, sun, (fire), and their relation to brahman. This theme is connected with speculations on the *prāṇāgnihotra* (and the actual practice of this rite in which meditation of this identification plays a role), and on the *agnicayana*.

A very essential part of this study was devoted to a criticism of the theory of Varenne and others⁴⁶ that the *prāṇāgnihotra* is performed exclusively by *saṃnyāsins* and hermits. Ch. XI tries to show that at least in later times there were no particular relations be-

tween this ceremony and the ascetics and that it mostly forms the *bhojanavidhi* of *grhasthas* (and others). Even the old passages dealing with the *prāṇāgnihotra* do not warrant the assumption that this rite has any exclusive connection with people other than householders.

The interpretation of MNU. engaged my special attention. In ch. X this text and Varenne's views⁴⁷ are amply discussed. The earliest full description of the rite at BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12 is investigated with special reference to the performers.⁴⁸ These turn out to be definitely householders.⁴⁹ Finally the references to the *prāṇāgnihotra* in VaiSmS.⁵⁰ are submitted to an examination. Both VaiSmS. and BDhŚ. prove that the *saṃnyāsins*' *bhojanam* may be regarded as an *ātmayājña* similar to the *prāṇāgnihotra* (or even identical to it), but that it is at least not the sole *prāṇāgnihotra*.⁵¹ There may be indications in VaiSmS. that the *prāṇāgnihotra* began to be performed at the *samāvartana*.⁵² From that time onwards the *ātmayājins* perform this rite during their whole life. Ch. X concludes with a discussion of the *ātmayājins* and the *ātmayājña*. These *ātmayājins* may be (still) unmarried *snātakas* (who have not yet established the fires), *saṃnyāsins* (who do not have fires anymore), but also householders (probably those who do not perform the *agnyādhāna*). The *ātmayājins* apparently did have a *grhya*-fire according to BDhŚ.⁵³

In the present study I have tried to show why a substitute-rite such as the *prāṇāgnihotra* did arise from the agnihotra and how several links exist between the śrauta rite and the *prāṇāgnihotra* *bhojanam*.⁵⁴ The question as to why the śrauta sacrifice was replaced by a more or less internal rite has not yet been answered. One may ask what was the position of this development in the context of a gradually changing attitude towards the ritual in general. According to Eliade⁵⁵ the Vedic ritual was no longer efficient for some people such as yogins and ascetics and therefore was replaced by meditation, mystical physiology etc. His concept of an interiorization of the sacrifice seems to include the *prāṇāgnihotra*. It is, however, doubtful whether these internal sacrifices such as the *prāṇāgnihotra* formed an attempt to keep the ascetics within the fold of brahmanism or hinduism.⁵⁶ The connection between asceticism and *prāṇāgnihotra* is rather dubious, as appears from this study. In a certain period the disappearance of the Vedic śrauta ritual was a general occurrence. There was no reason for *saṃnyāsins* to keep performing the *prāṇāgnihotra* as the pendant of the agnihotra since

this śrauta rite itself was hardly performed by the majority of the householders. The decline of the Vedic ritual coincided with the rise of new doctrines and "not rarely a meaning suitable to the new doctrine is read into the existing rite" or "conditions of the ātman, as embodied in the world of nature or of man, were substituted for the ceremonies of the ritual".⁵⁷ One should, however, bear in mind that the prāṇāgnihotra does not belong to the "neue Heilswege" which especially in the Gīta often appear under the name of sacrifice (*yajña*).⁵⁸ It is a ritual itself and it has several starting-points in the śrauta version. There is a gradual development from the actual agnihotra by way of its brāhmaṇa interpretations to the new prāṇāgnihotra rite.

In their paper "Indriya et le sacrifice des prāṇa", which seems to have generally escaped notice,⁵⁹ Sergiu Al-George and Arion Roșu regard the prāṇāgnihotra as a pre-Aryan or rather non-Aryan sacrifice. Before dealing with their views on the origin of the prāṇāgnihotra and its position in Indian culture I should like to pass criticism on some basic assumptions which are put forward in their article. In the interesting first chapter on the relation between the terms *prāṇāḥ* and *indriyāṇi* the two authors express the opinion that the identity of *prāṇāḥ* and *devāḥ*⁶⁰ can be explained in the framework of the concept of the incorporated deity: "Cette conception reconnaît l'existence du divin dans le corps humain, où peuvent résider un ou plusieurs dieux, vrai panthéon intérieur" (p. 357). They do admit that "le cadre de cette physiologie sacrée s'élargit par des correspondances entre les sens et les dieux. Ces correspondances vont transformer en quelque sorte le caractère original de la conception primitive, en la réduisant, en dernier lieu, à la formule des assimilations classiques impliquées dans l'identité du microcosme et du macrocosme" (p. 359). To me, however, it is highly dubious that this "conception primitive" (i.e. the concept of the "dieu incorporé") is distinct from the micro-macrocosmic identifications. The *adhyātmam* interpretation of cosmic, divine and ritual entities is rather old. The internal pantheon should not be regarded as a collection of gods to whom one should offer worship, but as the microcosmic equivalents of cosmic entities which traditionally have received the name of deities. In *adhidaivam* or *adhidevatam*, the counterpart of the term *adhyātmam*, the word *daiva-* has (macro)cosmic rather than divine connotations. The internal deity to whom one should offer worship is a late concept which came into existence after the ātman-brahman identification

and in Hinduism it is mostly connected with the worship of the *iṣṭadevatā*. Moreover the prāṇāgnihotra in the strict sense of the word seems to have developed from an *adhyātmam* interpretation in which the fires rather than the deities were made internal.

More serious objections can be raised against the authors' view that all kinds of disconnected rites, symbolisms, ritualistic speculations, etc. in which the *prāṇāḥ* (actually or supposedly) play a role should be brought together in their conception of the "sacrifices prāṇiques"; in some instances even the term prāṇāgnihotra is indiscriminately applied to entirely different phenomena. They regard the *prāṇāgnihotra*, the *antaram agnihotram*, the *ātmayajña*⁶¹ and the *sampradāna* ("qui ont été en général considérés isolément") as "des éléments d'un même tout" (p. 363). It would appear to the present author that a sharp distinction should be made between daily rites like the *prāṇāgnihotra-bhojanavidhi* and ceremonies performed once (*sampradāna*); between actual rites (*prāṇāgnihotra*) and esoteric interpretations (the *ātmayajña* in some respects); between rites with concrete oblations and physiological processes described as sacrifices; between sacrifices and modes of life identified with sacrifices; etc. Moreover the aims of the (actual or symbolic) sacrifices should be taken into account in establishing relationships and not features like the occurrence of the term *prāṇāḥ* or *prāṇa* (with an enormous divergence of religious and ritualistic functions). For the two authors nothing seems to stand in the way of an all-embracing structure: "Aux causes qui font obstacle à la reconstitution des sacrifices prāṇiques il convient d'ajouter l'ambiguïté des mots dans les différents textes: le *prāṇāgnihotra* connote le sacrifice offert aux *prāṇa*, aussi bien que le sacrifice dont les *prāṇa* eux-mêmes sont la matière, et l'*ātmayajña* est le sacrifice fait à l'*ātman*, aussi bien que le sacrifice de soi-même" (p. 363). The authors start from the hypothesis that the *prāṇa* is equal to *anna*⁶² in an effort to connect all sorts of "sacrifices des *prāṇa*" as "des modalités, ou même des étapes, dans le cadre général d'un sacrifice prāṇique" (for which they refer to a late text such as BhG. 4, 26 f.). In this way they arrive at the following set of three (in our view, disconnected) "sacrifices prāṇiques": a) the offering of oblations in the *prāṇāḥ*; b) the offering of the one *prāṇa* in the other or of the *prāṇāḥ* to the central *prāṇa*; c) the offering of the central *prāṇa* to the "divinités du dehors". One may also have some doubts about the following hypothetical development: "Il est possible même que les modalités, si on les considérait chrono-

logiquement, représentent des moments ou des étapes d'un sacrifice comprenant progressivement, de l'extérieur vers l'intérieur, premièrement l'objet des *prāṇa*-sens, puis les *prāṇa* eux-mêmes, et finalement le *prāṇa* central (*ātman*) dans un processus d'involution, d'annulation de la création" (p. 364).

Announcing on p. 364 a systematical treatment of the three forms of "sacrifices prāṇiques" to begin with "le sacrifice fait aux *prāṇa* secondaires", i.e. what we would call the prāṇāgnihotra, the authors include references to real prāṇāgnihotras, symbolic interpretations of the two daily agnihotras (in- and outbreathing), magic fire-rituals connected with the *prāṇāḥ*, symbolic explanations of life as the sacrifice of the objects of the senses into the senses, etc. etc. Even this first phase of the "sacrifices prāṇiques" forms a mixture of completely different religious ingredients which are only connected by the term *prāṇa*. This very term *prāṇa*, however, is equivocal when used in the plural. If one looks at the prāṇāgnihotra as described in the present book one has to make objections to a statement like: "Il vaut la peine de souligner que dans le sacrifice des *prāṇa*, malgré l'utilisation des deux schémas des *prāṇa*, on insiste surtout sur le schéma sensoriel, ce qui transforme le prāṇāgnihotra dans un sacrifice des sens" (p. 365) because in the prāṇāgnihotra-bhojanavidhi the identification of breaths and fires stands central and the formulas run *prāṇāya svāhā*, *apānāya svāhā*, etc. The second manifestation of the "sacrifices prāṇiques", the *ātmayajña* in which "ce sont ensuite les *prāṇa* secondaires eux-mêmes qui deviennent *anna* et sont sacrifiés au *prāṇa* central, l'*ātman*" (p. 366), is not very clearly explained by textual evidence.⁶³ In respect to the "dernier moment du sacrifice des *prāṇa*, qui en est également le moment suprême: le sacrifice du *prāṇa* central (*ātman*) et indirectement de tous les *prāṇa*, offert aux dieux" (p. 367) I again fail to see the relation between this "sacrifice" (suicide, *dīkṣā* and *sampradāna* seem to be meant) and the prāṇāgnihotra rite. I am not convinced by the authors' reassuring explanation: "On pourrait soulever une objection: l'oblation de l'*ātman* offert aux dieux extérieurs dépasse le cadre intime du sacrifice prāṇique. Nous estimons que ce qui caractérise le sacrifice des *prāṇa* n'est pas tant sa prédilection pour le panthéon intérieur, que surtout la manière de sacrifier, la nature de l'offrande. Les dieux, qu'il s'agisse du panthéon intérieur ou du panthéon extérieur, bénéficient, en union avec le cosmos, du sacrifice prāṇique" (p. 367 f.). This and the reference to ChU. 5, 24, 2-4⁶⁴ still do not explain the connection

between a prāṇāgnihotra-bhojanavidhi and suicide. Moreover, who are those "dieux" who ultimately get the benefit of these sacrifices performed by *ātmayājins* (in several texts explicitly differentiated from *devayājins*)? The main objections to the paper under criticism are that the authors have failed to examine the religious motives and objects of the so-called sacrifices; that they have constructed a theoretical framework based on secondary features like the occurrence of the term *prāṇa* and that instead of analyzing the material they have one-sidedly looked for ingenious agreements and have arbitrarily imposed a structure on the material which has crumbling cement, an unsound framework and a shaky foundation.

Therefore while reviewing the authors' views on the socio-ritualistic position of the "prāṇic" sacrifice one has to take into account some doubts about the field covered by the term "sacrifice des *prāṇa*". According to the authors it would be "un sacrifice physiologique, surtout sensoriel, qui équivaut pratiquement à une ascèse obtenue par une dépersonnalisation. C'est ainsi qu'il apparaît tout à fait différent du sacrifice védique, ce qui nous oblige à serrer de plus près l'étude comparative des deux sacrifices" (p. 371). It is their assumption that "la structure de l'expérience religieuse que renferme le sacrifice intérieur rend improbable une origine védique pour le prāṇāgnihotra" (p. 371). Starting from some remarks on the prāṇāgnihotra by Eliade,⁶⁵ who assumes an interiorization of the Vedic sacrifice due to non-brahmanic elements, they ask: is the prāṇāgnihotra only "une interprétation proprio modo du sacrifice védique",⁶⁶ une intériorisation de celui-ci, ou plus qu'une variante du sacrifice védique, un sacrifice à part, étranger au védisme et seulement transposé en termes védiques?" (p. 372). In view of the ritualism of the prāṇāgnihotra-bhojanavidhi one may doubt whether "le sacrifice prāṇique . . . n'observe pas la rigoureuse bipartition sacré-profane" (p. 372) and consequently lacks the characteristics of Vedic sacrifice. As far as the prāṇāgnihotra rite is concerned it is also not true that "il n'est pas circonscrit à une certaine période de temps" (p. 372). These two arguments do not warrant the conclusion that the origin of the prāṇāgnihotra should be looked for outside the Vedic world.⁶⁷ Indeed one may note several agreements between the *prāṇāgnihotra* and the *pūjā*, especially the Tantric form of *pūjā*. Indeed the *pūjā* may have originated from non-Aryan (non-Vedic) cults. Those agreements, however, refer to evidence from a comparatively late period. They hardly make clear how the prāṇā-

nihotra and related concepts did arise. The connection between the prāṇāgnihotra and some forms of Tantric pūjā is based on the fact that both represent an interiorization (of the Vedic rites and of the external pūjā). There are no indications that this interiorization was pre-Vedic. Even if the origin of the prāṇāgnihotra, which can be traced in the Vedic texts, may ultimately be due to non-Aryan, non-Vedic influence, this cannot be proved. The later developments of the pūjā do not have any demonstrative force. However interesting the digression on the *sampradāna* and its substrate origin may be, I disagree with Al-George's and Roşu's view that this ceremony has some connection with the prāṇāgnihotra in the framework of the concept of the "sacrifices prāṇiques".

Sometimes one assumes a distinction between the "outer" and the "inner" sacrifice. According to J. F. Staal, *Advaita and Neoplatonism* (Madras 1961), p. 71 f. the original Vedic sacrifice was both exterior and interior.⁶⁸ It would seem to me that Staal's picture of the Vedic sacrifice and its development is not acceptable in all respects. Too much stress is laid on the oppositions internal — external and spiritual — material. Moreover his use of the terms external and internal in connection with the ritual is debatable.⁶⁹ More important is the question of the aim of the sacrifice.⁷⁰ In the period of the brāhmaṇas the importance of the gods in the ritual is decreasing⁷¹ and worship is replaced by a more or less magical operation. The latter came to be interiorized in the exegesis of the brāhmaṇas. The interiorizing interpretation of the sacrifice which at first did not exclude the actual performance of the rite does not represent a reaction to a degeneration in later times with prevailing "outer" aspects.⁷² This development should be connected with the increasing interest in the self (the *adhyātmam* aspect). The self or the person as a totality became central; the self or "soul" as the manifestation of the highest principle or god became the object of the rites. The intention rather than the execution of the sacrifice changed. In fact the difference between actual performance and performance in thought is not essential if the aim of both rites is the same. A so-called internal rite like the prāṇāgnihotra is not the result of the abandonment of the fires, nor is its primary aim the removal of the fire-ritual. Not only the fires, but also the object of the sacrifice is interiorized. The supreme deity or brahman (the universal ātman) is present in the heart (the knot of the *prāṇāḥ*) as well as in the fire. A similar development takes place in the *pūjā*, where the

image of the deity is interiorized and receives worship in the heart.

Our picture of the prāṇāgnihotra as developed in the present study does not fit in with Staal's concept that "the ritual act can be gradually 'interiorised' and can lead to meditation and subsequently to immediate knowledge".⁷³ One may doubt, for that matter, whether a statement as "the ritual acts were 'interiorised' or spiritualised (leading to another act of equal importance: meditation, and hence to the Advaitic *jñāna* or *vidyā*)"⁷⁴ is supported by the evidence of the texts. The mental performance of a rite or its substitution by an internal rite in which one has to imagine the identity of e.g. fires and *prāṇāḥ*, deity and the Self, does not form an act of meditation. The prāṇāgnihotra as such has no relation to meditation,⁷⁵ but was in later times combined with meditation on the identity of ātman and brahman.⁷⁶ In Staal's work the prāṇāgnihotra and interiorization in general are rather forcedly regarded as meditation in order to contribute to an all-embracing theory of change and continuity in Indian mental attitudes explaining the continuum ranging from Vedic sacrifice to Vedāntic knowledge.

A different interpretation of the developments in Vedic sacrifice has been formulated by Heesterman⁷⁷ who takes the interiorization of the ritual "which makes the officiant's services superfluous" as the logical conclusion of the development of brahminical theory in which the ritual is individualized and "the host-guest, protagonist-antagonist complementarity was fused into the single unit of yajamāna and officiants".⁷⁸ If the term interiorization is applied to the agnihotra and its development into the prāṇāgnihotra,⁷⁹ it is the fire rather than the priest which is made superfluous; one may and actually does perform the agnihotra oneself. Moreover the prāṇāgnihotra does not seem to have special connections with renunciators as being the most individualized ritualists.⁸⁰ Whether Heesterman's hypothesis of the individuation of the sacrificer in classical times is correct or wrong is hard to decide since the preclassical evidence lies beyond our observation and distant echos dispersed through the classical material allow different interpretations. The conclusion of this process of individuation in the form of interiorization, however, takes places in a period which provides enough material to prove the theory with philologically sound arguments. The latter were neither adduced in Heesterman's paper nor discovered in the material at my disposal.⁸¹

Concluding this examination of the position of the prāṇāgnihotra in the ritual and religious context I would like to state the following points:

a) The development of the Vedic śrauta ritual to the prāṇāgnihotra and other "interiorized" sacrifices results from a combination of several factors.⁸² Every explanation which bases itself on one factor, selected in the framework of a general theory, runs the risk of creating a smooth, but one-sided and more or less theoretic outline of development into which only part of the textual and other evidence fits.⁸³

b) In using the term "interiorization" one should be aware of the fact that several disconnected phenomena are covered by this rather vague word.⁸⁴

c) If, realizing that the prāṇāgnihotra is not on a par with several other "interiorized" substitute-ceremonies, one nevertheless tries to discover a common starting-point, the concept of the *ātmayajña* and the *adhyātmam* interpretation turn out to play an important role.

d) The opposition between *devayājñin* and *ātmayājñin*⁸⁵ implies a change of religious outlook, not a total abolishment of the ritual. The development is not (exclusively) from Vedic ritualism to non-Vedic or post-Vedic non-ritualism and anti-ritualism. The ritualism generally remains in one or other form. Its object and consequently its performance and external features⁸⁶ change.

e) This change of object is a complicated affair. The symbolic interpretations, especially the *adhyātmam* explanation of the rite, have some influence on the meta-ritualistic level. However the rise of all kinds of religious and philosophical concepts (the relation ātman-brahman, worshipper-*iṣṭādevatā*; the growing influence of Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa and Śiva replacing the outdated Vedic objects of worship) seems to be important as well.

f) In the case of the prāṇāgnihotra the aim was first changed by the *adhyātmam* view which implied that the *prāṇāḥ*-fires became the object instead of the instrument of the rite, i.e. they became the deities or deity in and to which one sacrificed. This external manifestation of the divine object of the rite (which in fact was identical with the sacrificer's self) could easily be interiorized⁸⁷ (just as the external image in the pūjā ritual).

NOTES

¹ Some texts, however, seem to regard the internal, digestive fire in the stomach as the sacrificial fire or (as is done by ChU. 5, 18, 2, which represents heart and mind as the other fires) interpret the mouth as the āhavanīya.

² The plural *prāṇāhutis* may also be used for denoting the five offerings. The term *prāṇāhuti* occurs TĀ. 5, 4, 4 (*prāṇāhutir juhoti*) without any connection with the prāṇāgnihotra. See Sāyaṇa's commentary on TĀ. 4, 5, 1 (*prāṇāya svāhā . . etc.*) *iti sruvenāhavanīye saptaikadaśa vā prāṇāhutir juhoti*.

³ ChU. 5, 19 ff., one of the oldest sources of the prāṇāgnihotra, deals only with this prāṇāhuti. In the later period there is hardly any kind of bhojana in which at least this prāṇāhuti does not occur.

⁴ See ch. VII on BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12 and other ritualistic prāṇāgnihotra passages. The Appendix also refers to a detailed description of the ritual.

⁵ See (besides VII, X and the Appendix) especially ch. XI.

⁶ The agnihotra was indeed often interpreted symbolically (see V) but mostly there is no relation to the prāṇāgnihotra. KauṣU. 2, 5 (see V B) has been incorrectly connected with the prāṇāgnihotra by Varenne, but also by other scholars (Deussen, *Philos. of the Uṇ.*, p. 124; Eliade, *Le Yoga*, Paris 1960, p. 122). For a criticism of Varenne's assumption of a prāṇāgnihotra in BĀU. (and to some extent in ChU.) see VI D (on the *pañcāgnividyā*) and IX B (on the contest of the *prāṇāḥ*).

⁷ MNU. 547 speaking of a *jarāmaryam agnihotram sattram* does not refer to the prāṇāgnihotra rite which is performed twice a day or to any similar substitute of the agnihotra, but seems to interpret life itself as equal to the (lifelong) agnihotra. There is no fixed daily ritual. The same may be observed with regard to passages such as KauṣU. 2, 5, which still preserves the aspect of alternation present in the evening and morning agnihotra. See also Yati-dharmasamgraha, p. 154 *prapañcam akhilam yas tu jñānāgnau juhuyād yatih/ ātmany agnin samāropya so 'gnihotri na cetarah*. All these symbolic substitutes are not truly ritualistic replacements of the agnihotra. One may doubt whether a conscious and more or less ritualistic act such as the *prāṇāyāma* forms the substitute of the agnihotra as is sometimes assumed. Anyhow KauṣU. 2, 5 does not refer to the *prāṇāyāma* (otherwise Renou in the notes to his translation of KauṣU. and Eliade, *Le Yoga*, p. 122).

⁸ TS. 6, 1, 4, 5 the question is raised as to whether one should offer in the house of a consecrated. The problem is evaded by sacrificing in the breaths by way of Full and New Moon sacrifices. The context clearly shows that the agnihotra is not meant here. So there is no reason to regard this passage as referring to the prāṇāgnihotra (as is done by A. Coomaraswamy — see I, n. 2 — and perhaps by J. F. Staal, *Advaita and Neoplatonism*, Madras 1961, p. 72). A later Taittiriya text, viz. TĀ. 5, 2, 2, gives another solution for the same problem: *yajur eva vadet*.

⁹ On the qualifications of the agnihotra for the development into the prāṇāgnihotra see ch. II. For the microcosmic and macrocosmic interpretation see ch. V.

¹⁰ See II, n. 11 and IX A.

¹¹ See III, n. 14.

¹² See ch. V.

¹³ See the end of III (n. 28 f.); V B and C; IX, n. 51; X (n. 34 ff.). The *ātmayajña* interpretation often involved the abolishment of the actual performance of the śrauta rite. Even the *adhyātmam* interpretation of the actually performed sacrifice meant a change of object.

¹⁴ See III, n. 26.

¹⁵ The two daily bhojanas are reminiscent of the evening and morning agnihotra, but the relation to the moment of sunset and sunrise is lost and there is no significant difference in function between the two prāṇāgnihotras.

¹⁶ See JB. section 51-52, n. 2. MNU. 547 regards the whole life as a *jarā-maryam agnihotram satthram*.

¹⁷ See III, n. 19.

¹⁸ See III, n. 20.

¹⁹ See the end of ch. III and the beginning of ch. IV referring to JB. 1, 1-2.

²⁰ III passim (see especially n. 7 ff.).

²¹ III, n. 13. Often it is difficult to decide whether the text refers to a real expiation or not. Most of the symbolic and mental variants of a rite are connected with prāyaścittis or at least exceptional, incidental circumstances. The sacrifice in the prāṇa of TS. 6, 1, 4, 5 is a good example. According to TĀ. 5, 2, 2 one should make a mental performance in that case by reciting the formulas (see n. 8). One may compare the *pravāsāgnihotra* which should be performed by reciting the mantras, but which may also be substituted by a prāṇa-sacrifice in case of negligence (see V, n. 10 ff.). The latter prāṇa-sacrifice seems to be mere esoteric speculations, whereas the prāṇa-sacrifice of TS. 6, 1, 4, 5 may refer to a real ceremony performed by way of expiation (probably as an offering into oneself).

²² See ch. III (n. 10 ff.).

²³ III (n. 18) and IX A.

²⁴ On the meaning of "cosmification" see Eliade, "Cosmical Homology and Yoga", *J.I.S.O.A.* 5 (1937), p. 188 ff., especially p. 194: "The 'unification' of the body, of the breath and of the consciousness is nothing else but the first result of the yoga practices. The real 'unity' of man is obtained through a homologation with the 'Cosmos'". It should be observed that yogic aspect is missing in the GB. (and ChU.) passage. See also T. Goudriaan, "Vaikhānasa Daily Worship", *I.I.J.* 12 p. 161 ff. on a cosmification of the sacrificer who is identified with Brahman (p. 176 f.).

²⁵ IX, n. 4.

²⁶ IX A (n. 5).

²⁷ The clearest statements about this are made by Varenne using the term *mānasam yajñam* (see I, n. 1 and X, n. 3). Several other scholars regard the prāṇāgnihotra as a mental rite, e.g. Renou (*L'Inde Classique* I, p. 575): "Le prāṇāgnihotra de la *Chândogya* (...) qui transforme le vieux rite oblatoire en un rite mental, est une anticipation aussi bien du *dhyaṇa* que de la *prāṇa-pratiṣṭhā* tantrique". Eliade, *Le Yoga* (Paris 1960), p. 122 criticizes the term "mental sacrifice" without objecting to the qualification "mental": "Cette forme de sacrifice est généralement désignée du nom de 'sacrifice mental'. Nous l'appellerions plutôt 'intérieurisation rituelle', car elle implique, outre oraison mentale, une profonde assimilation des fonctions physiologiques à la vie cosmique". Eliade here refers to the prāṇāgnihotra of ChU. 5, 19 ff., but it should be noted that this "cosmification" is not found in all the contexts of the prāṇāgnihotra, whereas the "oraison mentale" forms a very doubtful point.

²⁸ See ch. IV.

²⁹ See IV, n. 7.

³⁰ See IV and V, n. 10.

³¹ The end of ch. IV deals with this passage.

³² IV, n. 8.

³³ I.e. the passage in BŚS. forms an important source for the passage in

BDhŚ., which does not imply that the prāṇāgnihotra as described in BDhŚ. (exclusively) originates from the substitute for the actual agnihotra which is performed by the old, decrepit agnihotrin (as described in BŚS.).

³⁴ Ch. VIII.

³⁵ See the end of VIII referring to the *naivedya* in the *pūjā* cremory.

³⁶ The prāṇāgnihotra did not arise from the śrāddha bhojana, but took some formulas from that ritual. The feeding of the five brahmins seems to constitute a cosmic prāṇāhuti in the mouth of brahman (= the brahmins). Some formulas which for the first time are introduced into the prāṇāgnihotra in BDhŚ. and MNU. make a more original impression in the śrāddha bhojanam in which they also appear. See VIII.

³⁷ VII, n. 11.

³⁸ VI. On the connection between this doctrine and the agnihotra see VI C. Partaking of food is called an agnihotra, see VI, n. 16.

³⁹ For this *pañcāgnividyā* and its relation to the prāṇāgnihotra which Varenne incorrectly assumes see VI D.

⁴⁰ Ch. V.

⁴¹ See V C on a ŚāṅkhB. passage which states that the knowledge of the agnihotra's macrocosmic and microcosmic implications and homologies makes the actual performance superfluous.

⁴² Even the *anīlaram agnihotram* of KauṣU. 2, 5 (ch. V B) has no connection with the prāṇāgnihotra. The agnihotra of the *pravāsa* as described in JB. 1, 20 (and parallels; see ch. V) may form a starting-point for the prāṇāgnihotra, but the relation of that breath-agnihotra to the ordinary prāṇāgnihotra is quite uncertain.

⁴³ Ch. IX.

⁴⁴ The contest of the *prāṇāh* (IX B), which Varenne associates with the prāṇāgnihotra, should be taken with the *mantha* ceremony (IX C). There is no reference to the prāṇāgnihotra in BĀU. 6, 1-2. In the fifth prapāṭhaka of ChU. this rite only plays a role at 5, 19 ff.

⁴⁵ See IX D. After remarking in his notes on MaiU. 1, 1 (see IX, n. 42) that the prāṇāgnihotra forms the intention of the text he concentrates all attention on the agnihotra as the central theme of this upaniṣad.

⁴⁶ See e.g. Eliade, *Le Yoga*, p. 122: "La conception de ce 'sacrifice intérieur' (referring to the prāṇāgnihotra of VaiSmS. 2, 18) est une conception féconde, qui permettra aux ascètes et mystiques même les plus autonomes, de se maintenir au sein du brahmanisme, et plus tard de l'hindouisme". Varenne's views as put forward in *La Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad* 2 have not been criticized in the reviews of that work (as far as I know), nor in later publications (see e.g. Heesterman, *W.Z.K.S.O.* 8 (1964), p. 23, n. 43; Gonda, *Viṣṇuism and Śivaism* (London 1970), p. 29).

⁴⁷ MNU. would form a breviary for samnyāsins to be used for their mental rites as the substitutes of the actual sacrifices and other ceremonies. This view as well as the assumption that MNU. forms a complete unity have been criticized. The discussion contains an analysis of the upaniṣad.

⁴⁸ The *śālīnas* as well as the *yāyāvaras* mentioned as the performers are householders. Especially the second group is often misinterpreted as "wandering ascetics". Their position seems to be intermediate between the orthodox householder and the *vānaprastha* in the late Vedic period: BDhŚ. 4, 5, 27 f. living on alms from agnihotrin, *yāyāvaras*, forest hermits, persons who have only food for one day, means purification within a month, ten days, five days, in one day. Vṛddha Harīta 7, 168 opposes the *yāyāvara* (the unsettled) to the (settled) agrarian. The *yāyāvara* who is always regarded as a householder and

who performed the śrauta ritual according to the older texts seems to have replaced the daily agnihotra by a halfmonthly rite. See BhārPiS. 2, 9, 2 and Caland, *Z.D.M.G.* 53, p. 227. Did the *yāyāvaras* also play a role in the replacement of the agnihotra by the prāṇāgnihotra which was more suitable for travelling people?

⁴⁹ I.e. the *śālīnas* and *yāyāvaras* mentioned at BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12 are definitely householders (otherwise Varenne, see ch. X, n. 19 f.), but the śaṃnyāsīn's bhojanam may as an ātmayajña have some similarities with the prāṇāgnihotra (BDhŚ. 2, 10, 18, 8 f.).

⁵⁰ See ch. X (n. 22 ff.).

⁵¹ See p. 301. The formulas recited at the śaṃnyāsīn's bhojanam seem to be different from the prāṇāgnihotra formulas. Moreover VaiSmS. 10, 7 (*prāṇāgnihotravidhānenātmayajñam samkalpya* . .) implies that the prāṇāgnihotra cannot be restricted to the sphere of the śaṃnyāsīns.

⁵² See ch. X (p. 302 ff.).

⁵³ BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 2 *sarvāvaśyakāvasāne* may be compared to VaiSmS. 9, 14 (: 131. 5) *homānte* (in the context of a bhojanavidhi with prāṇāhuti). On the problem of the prāṇāgnihotra and his fire(s) see ch. IV, n. 6.

⁵⁴ The following elements of the śrauta agnihotra recur in the prāṇāgnihotra bhojanavidhi: a) The twofold oblation in the form of the prāṇāhuti (with formulas) and the rest of the meal (*bhūyah*; silently; see the end of ch. IV); b) The mantras *vidyud asi vidya me pāpmānam* and *vṛṣṭir asi vṛṣca me pāpmānam* (see Appendix, n. 11 and 21); c) The mantras *ṛtaṃ tvā satyena pariśiñcāmi* and *satyaṃ tvartena pariśiñcāmi* (see e.g. BhārŚS. 6, 10, 1 for the agnihotra and VaiSmS. 9, 14 or ĀgnGS. 2, 6, 7 for the prāṇāgnihotra bhojanavidhi; see also Gonda, *Viṣṇuism and Śivaism*, p. 74, whose remark that the Hindu *saṃdhyā* rites have replaced the Vedic agnihotra may be modified; it is especially the bhojanavidhi which continues the agnihotra); d) The silence before the prāṇāhuti (see XI, n. 2) as in the agnihotra before the oblation (ĀpŚS. 6, 7, 3); e) The daśahotṛ formula (see Appendix, n. 13); f) The consumption of the food without being chewed (BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 8 *dantair nāvadyet*; see also ĀgnGS. 2, 6, 7 *na dantena khādet*; Gṛhastharatnākara p. 323 quoting Vāṣiṣṭha *hṛtsnam grāsam grasen na ca mukhaśabdāṃ kuryāt*) just as in the agnihotra ritual (ĀpŚS. 6, 11, 4 *aśabdāṃ kurvann atihāya datah*; cf. MS. 1, 8, 5: 122. 20); g) The two meals forming an *agnihotrāsamo vidhiḥ* (see V, n. 22; it should be noted that the śaṃnyāsīn's bhojanam does not take place every evening and morning and therefore does not show this strong parallelism with the agnihotra; on expiations for the incidental omission of the rite see BDhŚ. 2, 7, 13, 9 ff.).

⁵⁵ "Cosmical Homology and Yoga", *J.I.S.O.A.* 5 (1937), p. 188 ff. "The Upaniṣads (.), the 'yogins' and ascetics of the different sects contemporary with the Buddhist movement do not believe anymore in the efficiency of Vedic ritual. They all seek for and find the 'real', the 'sacred', the absolute, in an 'interiorization' of the sacrifice" (p. 189). See also, o.c., p. 193.

⁵⁶ See n. 46. Eliade who bases himself on only one or two prāṇāgnihotra passages lays to much stress on the "cosmification" of the performer, which in fact is only found in some passages, and tends to overestimate the connection with yoga. The relevant passages dealing with "cosmification" in the context of the prāṇāgnihotra have no relation at all to yoga or asceticism. Moreover this kind of "cosmification" occurs in the brāhmaṇas without any connection with interiorized ritual. See also n. 24.

⁵⁷ Deussen, *The Philosophy of the Upaniṣads*, p. 63.

⁵⁸ J. Neuner, "Religion und Riten. Die Opferlehre der Bhagavadgita",

Zs. f. Kath. Theol. 73 (1951), p. 170 ff. See especially p. 177: "Allen diesen Umformungen des Opferbegriffes ist eines gemeinsam, dass sie nur die Ausweitung des religiösen Ideals sind, das über den rituellen Bereich hinauswuchs und sich neue Formen und Methoden suchte, dabei aber mit der zentralen Ideen des traditionellen religiösen Lebens in Verbindung zu bleiben suchte". "In der spät- und nachvedischen Zeit erweitert und wandelt sich der Opferbegriff, indem er sich auf die neu aufkommenden Heilswege ausdehnt" (p. 184; cf. Das Gupta, *Hist. of Ind. Phil.* II, p. 487 f.). On these symbolic "sacrifices" see BhG. 4, 24 ff. (dealing with the *karmayoga*). Zaehner, *The Bhagavad-Gīta* (Oxford 1969), p. 193 is wrong in connecting BhG. 4, 27 with the *prāṇāhuti* as described at ChU. 5, 19-24 since the *prāṇāh* are not the oblation in the prāṇāgnihotra. In his interpretation the *prāṇākarmāṇi* should be "'works of vital breath': the offering of the five 'vital breaths' to the self". If we assume a reference to the prāṇāgnihotra in these symbolic sacrifices, I should propose BhG. 4, 30 *apare niyatāhārāḥ prāṇān prāṇeṣu juhvati*. In that case one might compare JB. 1, 1-2 on the offering of *prāṇa* in *prāṇa*, i.e. the giving of life to the lifebreaths by means of food. The restriction of the food may imply that one should not eat food in the intervening period between the two meals ("... if he acts up to this advice he reaps the merit of a fast", Kane, *Hist. of Dharmaś.* II, p. 760) or that the meal should be limited to 8, 16 or 32 morsels (for śaṃnyāsīns, hermits and householders). All this is doubtful and the text may simply refer to fasting and replacement of the meals by breathing exercises.

⁵⁹ The paper was published in 1957 in *M.I.O.* 5, p. 346-397, but it is not mentioned in any literature consulted by me (except Dandekar's *Vedic Bibliography* II, 1961, p. 409) and came to our notice only after the manuscript had been finished and sent to the printer. A reaction to this paper, which does not agree with the present book in all respects, is inserted here. I should also like to draw attention to two other papers by Arion Roṣu, "Vācaspati" and "Véd. indriyam vīryam", which were published in *M.I.O.* 7 (1959) and refer to some aspects of the first-named paper.

⁶⁰ On this point see also JB. translation, Section 1-2, n. 12.

⁶¹ The term is constantly provided with an asterisk in the paper due to the misconception that "on ne rencontre dans les textes que le substantif *ātmayajin*" (p. 363, n. 113).

⁶² "Le sacrifice prāṇique procède de la nature complexe du *prāṇa*, à la fois dieu (*deva*) et nourriture (*anna*). C'est ainsi que s'explique le fait que dans le sacrifice des *prāṇa* les dieux du panthéon intérieur, nourris par l'offrande de l'*anna*, peuvent cependant être sacrifiés à leur tour aux autres divinités supérieures en tant que *anna*" (p. 364).

⁶³ E.g. the reference to AB. 7, 2, 12 *prāṇān vā eṣo 'bhyātmaṃ dhātve yo 'gnīn ādhatte* (which explains that the ritualistic establishment of the fires has an *adhyātmaṃ* counterpart) is strikingly wrong if one has in view "certain texts, où l'*ātmayajña* apparaît comme une oblation des *prāṇa* dans le feu de l'*ātman*". BhG. 4, 26 (*śrotādinīndriyāṇy anye saṃyamāgniṣu juhvati*) does not deal with "la consommation des *prāṇa* dans le feu ātmique" (p. 366), but only describes the restraint of the senses with a sacrificial metaphor; or rather it declares this restraint to be identical with, and equal to, the orthodox sacrifice. The restraint and not the ātman represents the fire. There is no need to discuss here again the inevitable reference to KauṣU. 2, 5.

⁶⁴ *tasya sarveṣu lokeṣu sarveṣu bhūteṣu sarveṣu ātmasu hutam bhavati . . . ātmani haivāśya tad vaiśvānare hutam syād iti*. Since all the ātmans are identical among themselves and together identical to the cosmic Ātman, offering in the

own internal ātman means offering in all ātmans. This ātman-doctrine which in ChU. has been connected with the prāṇāgnihotra does not alter the situation that the oblation is offered in oneself and to one's ātman. The "offering" of one's own prāṇa into one's son (in the *sampradāna*) is completely different from a ritualistic and religious point of view.

⁶⁵ Eliade, *Yoga. Essai sur les origines de la mystique indienne*, Paris-Bucarest, 1936, p. 112-113; *Techniques du Yoga*, Paris, 1948, p. 117, 143.

⁶⁶ Eliade, *Techniques du Yoga*, l.c.

⁶⁷ "La théorie générale du sacrifice, élaborée par R. Hubert et M. Mauss, dans laquelle le sacrifice des *prāṇa* ne rentre pas, est fondée sur les données du sacrifice védique et sémitique, appartenant à des sociétés évoluées, qui opposaient le sacré au profane. Donc, les origines du *prāṇāgnihotra* doivent être recherchées en dehors du monde védique" (o.c., p. 374). Apart from the factual incorrectness (the statement on the missing opposition between sacred and profane) one may put some question-marks after his formulation of a conclusion.

⁶⁸ "Separation of the two constitutes degeneration: the sacrifice became an external act, after which it was only natural that the possibility of an internal act, which only then came into existence, should be realized (...); the degeneration itself, caused by the loss by sacrifice of its creative and discovery function has two aspects: exteriorisation and interiorisation. "Inner" sacrifice is required only in the case of prevailing "outer" sacrifice, which occurs only at a later stage. It is therefore incorrect to say that the older texts lack the "inner" and purely spiritual sacrifice (...). Originally there was nothing external and therefore no need for anything internal" (o.c., p. 71 f.).

⁶⁹ The opposition between outer and inner worship in the ritual and the *pūjā* is mostly rather different from the one meant by Staal. His terminology is confusing.

⁷⁰ Various opinions on the (original) meaning and function of the (Vedic) sacrifice (see Hubert and Mauss, *Année Sociologique* II, 1897-98) have been put forward (see Keith, *Religion and Philosophy*, p. 257 ff.), but so much is clear that in the oldest period the gods often form the object of the sacrifice. They are worshipped and receive oblations as a gift (see Oldenberg, *Religion des Veda*, p. 313; Keith, o.c., p. 259).

⁷¹ See Gonda, *Religionen Indiens* I, p. 105 and especially Lévi, *Doctrine du sacrifice*, p. 129: "Le sacrifice a donc tous les caractères d'une opération magique, indépendante des divinités, efficace par sa seule énergie et susceptible de produire le mal comme le bien". This development cannot be translated into terms as "interiorisation". In what period does the degeneration in the form of "exteriorisation" take place according to Staal?

⁷² See n. 59 on Staal's use of the term "outer"; see also n. 60. Here "outer" seems to be meant as identical with "rigid": "... the central place accorded to the sacrifice led to over-emphasis and codification, which became increasingly rigid" (o.c., p. 70).

⁷³ O.c., p. 39.

⁷⁴ O.c., p. 70. Several other lines of development leading to *vidyā* may be construed with as much or more probability.

⁷⁵ Staal, o.c., p. 72 mentions the *prāṇa*-sacrifice of TS. 6, 1, 4, 5 as a "transition to the inner sacrifice" and observes with regard to the *prāṇāgnihotra* of ChU. that "the performance of the *agnihotra* is replaced by a meditation on these identifications and connections" (p. 73; referring to the identifications of mouth and āhavanīya, etc.); "Thus a sacrificial act is replaced

by an act of meditation" (p. 74). It should be observed that this "meditation", if playing a role at all, does not form the substitute of the offering in the fires. On the other hand Staal is of the opinion that the ChU. *prāṇāgnihotra* "still is not a completely inner sacrifice" (p. 75), but a transition to the act of meditation. A text like KauṣU. 2, 5 would be more explicit (o.c., p. 75). The passage mentioned neither refers to meditation nor to the *prāṇāgnihotra*.

⁷⁶ For meditation in connection with the *prāṇāgnihotra* see IX, n. 51 and 56.

⁷⁷ "Brahmin, Ritual and Renouncer", *W.Z.K.S.O.* 8 (1964), p. 1 ff. See especially p. 22.

⁷⁸ O.c., p. 22. See also p. 27: "Moreover it should also be taken into consideration that interiorization meant the real fusion into one person of patron and officiant".

⁷⁹ This rite is mentioned o.c., p. 23.

⁸⁰ Heesterman, o.c., p. 23 refers to the *samnyāsin's* *bhojanam* as described at BDhŚ. 2, 10, 18, 8 (for a different interpretation see ch. X, p. 300), which is not a clear *prāṇāgnihotra*, and to Varenne's doubtful interpretation of the *prāṇāgnihotra* in MNU. See also o.c., p. 27 on a "close solidarity between ritualistic and renunciatory thought and practice" in connection with the *prāṇāgnihotra* and *ātmayajñas*.

⁸¹ The *sūtras* do not make the impression that the *agnihotra* performed by the sacrificer himself was a late development, whereas on the other hand the starting-points for the *prāṇāgnihotra* and even a late *ātmayajña* description as found at VāsdhŚ. 30, 2 (see III, n. 14) seem to imply that a brahmin receives the food-oblation.

⁸² In the case of the *prāṇāgnihotra* and its development from the *agnihotra* many starting-points can be indicated. Not all of them have to be taken at face value — I have noted that some expiations are used as a pretext for introducing esoteric truths and practices —, but enough diversity in the material remains which should warn us to be careful in our judgement.

⁸³ Similar views were expressed by Thomas G. Gornan and Ronald S. Laura in their paper "A logical treatment of some Upaniṣadic puzzles and changing conceptions of sacrifice", *Numen* 19 (1972), p. 52-67, which came to my notice after the manuscript had been sent to the press. See especially p. 52 and 67 which advocate "a careful scrutiny of the individual contexts in which sacrifice is found rather than the continued search for a model which has the capacity to transcend contextual boundaries". However, it has to be observed that the contextual research (and the general introduction on the meaning of sacrifices) of the two authors does not yield surprising results.

⁸⁴ It may refer to the mental performance of a rite, the actual performance with an esoteric, *adhyātmam* interpretation, the replacement of a rite by a corporeal process, the replacement by new doctrines of life and practices, and finally rites such as the *prāṇāgnihotra* which very clearly has its roots in the *śrauta* paradigm and retains many ritualistic features.

⁸⁵ See X, n. 35 f. and 41 f. A similar opposition may be found at BhG. 4, 12 *kāṅkṣantaḥ karmanām siddhiṃ yajanta iha devatāḥ* (the *devayājīn*) and 4, 24 ff. (the *ātmayājīn*).

⁸⁶ S. N. Dasgupta, *Hindu Mysticism* (London 1927) dealing with "sacrificial mysticism" mentions a substitution-meditation. See p. 18: "The next step in the development of this type of mysticism consists in the growth of a school of thought which sought to intellectualize the material sacrifices". Too much emphasis seems to be laid on the antithesis material-intellectual. The

most important change which first had to take place referred to the aim of the rite and the adaptation to changing views.

⁸⁷ According to Deussen, *The Philosophy of the Upanishads*, p. 124 "After the prāṇa, indwelling in us all, had been introduced in place of the gods, the attempt was made to replace the *agnihotram* or fire-sacrifice by a *prāṇa-agnihotram*, a sacrifice offered in the fire of prāṇa". This is part of the truth. Indeed, the prāṇa became equal to the ātman and the cosmic ātman, viz. brahman, but on the other hand there was another development which identified the fires and the *prāṇāḥ*. The latter took place first.

APPENDIX

THE PRĀṆĀGNIHOTRA ACCORDING TO THE PRAPAṆCA-SĀRAVIVARAṆA, THE COMMENTARY ON THE PRAPAṆCASĀRATANTRA, ASCRIBED TO PADMAPĀDA

PrapT. 8, 14:1 "For those who know the mantras² and daily worship³ in that way⁴ the winds of the body (*marutaḥ*) *prāṇa* etc. are the fire-holes (*kunḍāni*) such as gārhapatya etc. in their ceremonies of dining".

Padmapāda's commentary of 8, 14-21: "In this case the arrangement of the sacrifice is as follows. Having visualized the favourite deity⁵ and having meditated on him he should kindle the (internal) fires⁶ in the southern, northern, western, eastern and middle fire-pits with the mantras *om śraddhāyām prāṇe niviṣṭo 'mṛtaṃ juhomi* up to *śraddhāyām brahmaṇi mātṛmā niviṣṭo 'mṛtaṃ juhomi*.⁷ Having taken the oblation on a (representation of a) lotus decorated with the sacred syllable *Om*⁸ he should worship it with *annam prāṇam annam apānam āhuḥ | annam mṛtyum tam u jīvātum āhuḥ | annam brahmaṇo jivasam vadanti | annam āhuḥ prajananam prajānām*.⁹ He consecrates it three times with the *gāyatri*¹⁰ accompanied with a ten-fold *Om* and washes his hands with *vidyud asi vidya me pāpmānam*.¹¹ He pours water around (the food-oblation), touches water and sips water with the mantras *om tad brahma | om tad vāyuh | om tad ātmā | om tat satyam | om tat sarvam | om tat puro namaḥ | om antaś carati bhūteṣu guhāyām viśvamūrṭiṣu | tavṃ yajñas tvam vaśatkāras tvam viṣṇuḥ puruṣaḥ paraḥ || tvam āpaḥ āpo jyoti raso 'mṛtaṃ brahma bhūr bhuvaḥ svar om || amṛtopastaranam asi*.¹² He mutters *citiḥ sruk, cittam ājyam* (.. etc.)¹³ and offers in the southern (northern/western/eastern/middle) fire with *om gārhapatya (anvāhārye/āhavanīye/sabhye/āvasathīye) prāṇe (apāne/vyāne/udāne/samāne) hiranyavarṇāḥ (gaganavarṇāḥ/raktavarṇāḥ/kṛṣṇavarṇāḥ/suprabhāvarṇāḥ) śucayaḥ pāvakaḥ agniṃ vihrītyātmānam upacaryordhvaṃ (adho/tiryag/ūrdhvādhas-tiryag/samaṃ) gacchatu svāhā*¹⁴ || *śraddhāyām prāṇe (apāne/vyāne/udāne/samāne) niviṣṭo 'mṛtaṃ juhomi | śivo mā viśā-pradāhāya*¹⁵ *prāṇātmane (apānātmane .. etc.) nārāyaṇāya mahyam mahyam svāhā*¹⁶. Then he unites the fires and offers with the mantras *om gārhapatya—āvasathīyeṣu prāṇa—samāneṣu hiranya—suprabhā-*

*varnāḥ śucayaḥ pāvakā agniṃ vihr̥tyātmānam upacaryordhva—
samam gacchatu svāhā* ||¹⁷ *aḥam vaiśvānaro bhūtvā juhomy annam
caturvidham pacāmi* ||¹⁸ *śraddhāyām brahmaṇi ma ātmā niviṣṭo 'mṛtam
juhomi | śivo mā viśāpradāhāya kṣetrajñātmane nārāyaṇāya mahyam
mahyam svāhā.*¹⁷ Silently he offers a rather full (second) oblation.¹⁹
He covers (the food) with water,²⁰ rinses his mouth etc., sips water
and washes his hands with *vṛṣṭir asi vṛṣca me pāpmānam amṛtātma-
tvam upāgām.*²¹ (He touches his heart with) *prānānām granthir asi
rudro mā viśāntakas tenānnenāpyāyasva.*²² With *aṅguṣṭhamātrah
puruṣo 'ṅguṣṭham ca samāśritah | īśaḥ sarvasya jagataḥ prabhuh
pr̥ṇāti viśvabhuk*²³ he should pour a stream of water on the big toe
of his left foot and with *ud vāyam* (...), *citram* (..) he should do
worship.²⁴ Then he should cause the Amṛtam to flow with the syl-
lable *Om*, as is also said in the text with *ārabhya* etc.²⁵

Commentary of 8, 22-23: "The Amṛtam should also be made to
flow by means of the alphabet (*mātrkā*) as the text says with *saṃ-
cintya* ...²⁶ Thereupon, after having pronounced the following
mantras with a strengthening function *śraddhāyām prāne niviṣyām-
tam hutam prānam annenāpyāyasva* up to *śraddhāyām brahmaṇi ma
ātmā niviṣyāmṛtam hutam brahmānam annenāpyāyasva*,²⁷ he should
conclude (the rite) with *aṅganyāsa*, *ṛṣinyāsa* etc.²⁸

NOTES

¹ The text of this tantra (which is incorrectly ascribed to Śaṅkara) has
been edited by Avalon as vols. 18 and 19 of the *Tantrik Texts*. Part II, p. 381
ff. contains the *vyākhyā* of the Prapañcasāravivarāṇa, called Prayogakrama-
dīpikā. The appendix starts with PrapT. 8, 14 because the commentary
(incorrectly ascribed to Padmapāda) here begins a long passage on the prā-
ṇāgnihotra as a bhojanavidhi with several insertions from the ancient ritual
which are interesting for the present study. Without these additions of the
commentary the tantric prāṇāgnihotra of PrapT. 8, 14 ff. would be very
remote from the classical type as it appears in the preceding pages. Moreover
this tantra (as well as its commentary and sub-commentary) seems to assume
another prāṇāgnihotra besides the one performed as a bhojanavidhi. See n. 4.
PrapT. 8, 1 ff. refers to a mental rite which is called prāṇāgnihotra. See also
PrapT. 6, 67 in which a comparison is made with the prāṇāgnihotra in con-
nection with internal fires and mental sacrifices; the commentary of 6, 68-79
states: *tatra prāṇāgnihotravidhinā sakṛt varṇahomam vidhāya*. The sub-
commentary of 6, 85 ff. mentions ... *prāṇāgnihotravidhināpiti vā tatra sarvāṇy
api bhāvanīyāni*. The comm. and sub-comm. of the seventh chapter contain
several references to this purely mental prāṇāgnihotra at the beginning of
chapter VIII which has no relation to the prāṇāgnihotra performed *āśanakāle*,
but is tantric-yogic (offering of garlands of letters etc.). See e.g. the sub-comm.
of 7, 25; 7, 29; 7, 35 f.; 7, 47; 7, 52 and the comm. of 7, 29 ff.; 7, 48 f.; 7, 51

and 52 which especially deal with the relations and correspondences between
the *prāṇāgnihotra* and a *prapañcayāga*.

² The commentator seizes the opportunity to introduce an elaborate
prāṇāgnihotra as found in BDhŚ. by observing that by "for those who
know the mantras" the text implies that some additional mantras which are
not mentioned in the tantra itself may be supplied (*mantravidām ity anena
prāṇāgnihotrāśeṣabhūtāḥ kecana mantrāḥ sūcitāḥ*).

³ The Dīpikā supplies *devatā* as the object. Moreover the verb *bhaj-* seems
to refer to the action which has taken place (see n. 4) and not to partaking of
food. Strangely enough PrapT. 8, 23 seems to exclude the meaning "to
worship": *sāyam prātar anena homavidhinā bhojyāni nityam bhajan* (cf. 8, 14
anudinam amunā bhajatām vidhināhārakriyāsu mantravidām ...). If a uniform
meaning of *bhaj-* should be retained at both places, one might take *āhārakri-
yāsu* with *bhajatām*. The problem remains that *amunā* ... *vidhinā* should refer
back and that *bhajatām* is placed between these two words.

⁴ *amunā* ... *vidhinā* (see n. 3) refers back to the beginning of this chapter
which deals with a mental rite which is called prāṇāgnihotra too. See n. 1.
The text of the Vivaraṇa *uktah prāṇāgnihotrakaratiṇām* ... should perhaps be
emended to *uktapraṇāgnihotrakaratiṇām āśanakāle prāṇāgnihotrādhikāra ity
āha*. See the Dīpikā: *prāṇāgnihotrāntarārambhaḥ. tatrābhiprāyabhedam apy
āha — ukteti. asti hy āśanakāle 'pi prāṇāgnihotram. tatrokta-prāṇāgni-
hotrayoginām evādhikāro 'py anenokta ity arthah*. On these two prāṇāgnihotras
see also the Dīpikā's commentary of 8, 23 (end): *ya evam ubhayavidham prā-
ṇāgnihotram niyamenānutiṣṭhati sa* (...) *udaram garbhataḥ na praviṣati*.

⁵ The commentary mentions a *sakalīkaraṇam* (see Gonda, *Viṣṇuism and
Śivaism*, p. 84 on this term); the sub-commentary refers to *lipinyāsaḥ*.

⁶ These fires have been mentioned at 8, 2 (see the Vivaraṇa and especially
the Dīpikā on their position *yogakāle* and *āśanakāle*).

⁷ The mantras MNU. 473-478 accompany the kindling of the fires here.
They do not occur with this function in BDhŚ. Before *śraddhāyām* the present
version adds *om*. The final formula forms a combination of the preceding
mantras *śraddhāyām* ... *niviṣṭo 'mṛtam juhomi* and MNU. 478 *brahmaṇi ma
ātmāmṛtatvāya*. The secondary explanation also appears from the fact that
five fires can hardly be kindled by six formulas. The Dīpikā suggests that by
the sixth mantra the fifth fire (in the middle) should be kindled again.

⁸ *sapraṇava itī svābhīṣṭamantrasyāpi yantralīpīpadmakarnīkāyām kal-
panīyam* (Dīpikā).

⁹ TB. 2, 8, 3. Read *brahmāṇo jarasam*. The mantras of TB. 2, 8, 8 deal
with food and its consumption. ĀgnGS. 2, 6, 7 prescribes in its (prāṇāgni-
hotra) bhojanavidhi the recitation of TB. 2, 8, 8, 1 ff.: *annasūktenānnam
abhimṛṣati 'aḥam asmi prathamajā ṛtasya' itī dasarcena sūktena*. VaiSmS. 2,
18 (*prāṇāgnihotra*) similarly refers to this *annasūkta*, which according to
Caland (VaiSmS. tr., p. 65, n. 5) "agrees with TBr. II. 8. 8. 1-4". Apparently
Padmapāda partially quotes this *annasūkta*. Gonda's note on the *annasūkta*
in *Viṣṇuism and Śivaism*, p. 191 (n. 309) should be corrected.

¹⁰ See IX, n. 49 for the use of the *gāyatri* (and the *pranava*) in the prāṇāgni-
hotra.

¹¹ This mantra (TB. 3, 10, 9, 2), to be recited by the yajamāna "wenn er
im Begriff steht, ein Opfer für sich veranstalten zu lassen" (Caland, ĀpŚS.
4, 1, 6) at the touching of water, is also recited by the officiant in the ritual
of the agnihotra when he touches water just before offering the oblation
(ĀpŚS. 6, 9, 3; ĀśvŚS. 2, 3, 16). BhārŚS. 6, 1, 5 and 7 seems to apply this
formula only to the sacrificer (the context refers to the yajamāna), who may

perform the agnihotra himself: .. *iti hoṣyann apa upasṛset* .. *evam eva sarveṣu yajñakratuṣu yakṣyamānas* .. *apa upasṛṣati*.

¹² The usual formula recited at the ācamana is *amṛtopastaraṇam asi* (MNU. 479), whereas the others (MNU. 467-472) form "un petit groupe de formules sans affectation rituelle précise" according to Varenne, o.c. I, p. 115. In the correct arrangement of MNU. the mantra 479 should directly follow on 472. According to Gobhila (a prāṇāhulikāpa quoted by *Smyṛticandrikā* II, p. 606) and Hārīta (a bhojanavidhi found in the *Gṛhastharatnākara*, p. 317) the other formulas immediately precede *amṛtopastaraṇam asi*. One recites them according to ŚaṅkhaSm. 10, 17 in the ācamana ritual while touching water. The Dīpikā of this Tantra remarks: *om tad brahmety ārabhyācamana-mantraḥ* (whereas the preceding actions *parisicyopasṛṣya*, for which no mantras are given, would be according to the *svakalpoktarīti*). MNU. 467 reads *om tad pūḥ/om namaḥ* (with *om tat pūror namaḥ* quoted from the other recensions). MNU. 470-71 is rather different from the present text. See also PrāṇU. 11-13 (and 16) on these formulas.

¹³ TĀ. 3, 1, 1 (*daśahotr* formula). A. japa. Cf. *Smyṛticandrikā* II, p. 606 (prāṇāhulikāpa ascribed to Gobhila): *daśahotāraṇaṁ manasānūdrutya* (same position in the context as here). Read *cittīḥ* for *citīḥ* and *vidhes* for *vidhe*. TĀ.: *āsmāsu nṛmṇan dhāt*; Padmapāda: *āsmā nṛmṇaṁ dhyāt*. The formula is also used in the agnihotra (see e.g. ĀpŚS. 6, 8, 5 and 7).

¹⁴ I have not found any parallels for these mantras. Only *hiraṇyavarṇaḥ śucayaḥ pāvakaḥ* (TS. 5, 6, 1, 1) is rather frequently used elsewhere, but not in prāṇāgnihotra contexts. The tantric formulas of the commentary are based on succinct indications of the Tantra (8, 15 ff.) itself, such as "he should pronounce the name of the fire-pits and the internal airs in the locative, the colours golden .." etc. (*saptamyantāṁ ca kuṇḍāḥkhyāṁ ākhyāṁ ca marutāṁ api/ hiraṇyāgaganāraktākṣṇābhīr varṇaṁ irayet/| sasuprabhābhīḥ sahitaṁ śucayaḥ pāvakaḥ iti*). For a different connection between the five prāṇāḥ and colours see Woodroffe, *Introduction to Tantra Shastra*, p. 43 and especially O. V. Garrison, *Tantra. The Yoga of Sex* (New York 1964), p. 213 f. (where prāṇa = "golden radiance"). The Dīpikā remarks that with this first *svāhā* the mantra of the Tantra ends. The other formulas have been supplied (*mantravidāṁ ity anena tu mantrasaḥ 3pi sūcitaḥ*). I am not able to decide whether the Vivaraṇa has correctly interpreted the indications of the Tantra with regard to its formulas.

¹⁵ MNU. 480 ff.

¹⁶ *prāṇāya svāhā* etc. of MNU. has been replaced by *prāṇātmane* etc. *nārāyaṇāya mahyaṁ mahyaṁ svāhā* (no parallels).

¹⁷ The unification of the fires and the combination of the five formulas is based on PrapT. 8, 17-19. However, *śraddhāyāṁ brahmaṇi* ... is again an addition of the commentary partly based on the version of MNU. 485 (see also n. 7). Apparently all the fires, all the prāṇāḥ, are combined into the one prāṇa which is identical with the soul (*kṣetrajña*) and at the same time with brahman or Nārāyaṇa (who fivefoldly distributes himself over the prāṇāḥ).

¹⁸ This mantra (which is also given by the Tantra) is found at BhG. 15, 14.

¹⁹ Here *āpūrṇam* refers to the substitute of the second agnihotra oblation, which should be larger (*bhūyaḥ*) than the first (represented by the fivefold prāṇāhuti). See ch. IV.

²⁰ *adbhīḥ pidhāya* implies the *āpośāna* formula *amṛtāpidhānam asi*.

²¹ For this mantra (TB. 3, 10, 9, 2) compare n. 4. It is recited in the agnihotra ritual by the officiant, who touches water after having offered (ĀpŚS. 6, 11, 4; ĀsvŚS. 2, 3, 23). According to BhārŚS. 6, 1, 6-7 this seems again to

refer to the sacrificer (who performs the agnihotra himself): .. *iti hutvā. evam eva sarveṣu yajñakratuṣu .. iṣṭvā .. apa upasṛset*. Instead of .. *pāpmānam rītāṁ satyaṁ upāgām* (the sūtras) this tantric text reads .. *pāpmānam amṛtāmatvaṁ upāgām*. A simple corruption (dittography of *am*) or a deliberate adaptation? The commentary contains more wrong readings.

²² MNU. 498; BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 10. See ch. VII.

²³ MNU. 492-93; BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 11. See ch. VII.

²⁴ *ud vayaṁ tamasaḥ pari* .. (RV. 1, 50, 10) is i.a. recited after the samnyāsin's bhojanam (BDhŚ. 2, 10, 18, 11 *prāśyāpa ācamya jyotiṣmatyādityam upatiṣṭhate/ ud vayaṁ tamasaḥ pariti*) the mantra *citraṁ devānāṁ udagād* (RV. 1, 115, 1) occurs together with *ud vayaṁ* .. BDhŚ. 2, 5, 8, 12 and elsewhere in the worship of the sun. The Dīpikā does not agree with the Vivaraṇa and (incorrectly) connects these formulas with PrapT. 8, 21 *ārabhya mūlādhāraṁ svam ā mastakam anusmaret*.

²⁵ This refers to PrapT. 8, 21 (see n. 24).

²⁶ PrapT. 8, 23 dealing with the *mātrkānyāsa* (on which see Woodroffe, *Intr. to Tantra Shastra*, p. 107 f.).

²⁷ MNU. 487-491 (where the last formula is missing). This is the *hutānu-mantraṇam* of BDhŚ. 2, 7, 12, 12 f., where the last formula runs *brahmaṇi ma ātmāmṛtatvāya*.

²⁸ On these *nyāsa*s see Woodroffe, o.c., p. 109 f.; Gonda, *Viṣṇuism and Śivaism*, p. 73 and 181, n. 134.

CONCISE BIBLIOGRAPHY

An exhaustive bibliography is superfluous in the field of Vedic studies since all information can be found in Renou's *Bibliographie védique* (Paris 1931) and Dandekar's *Vedic Bibliography* I-II (Poona 1946-61). In the lists of abbreviations all the Sanskrit texts quoted by me are listed (with short indications about the editions and translations used). The following list of publications does not give information on all the literature which has been read or which should be read, nor even on all the titles quoted in this work, but only covers that literature which has been frequently (or incompletely) mentioned and which has some relevance to the subject-matter of this book. For literature on the Jaiminiya studies see also the Introduction; on the funeral rites and the expiations see the introductions to the relevant sections of the translation (46-49 and 51-65). All the introductions to the sections of the translation contain bibliographical references.

- AGRAWALA, V. S., "The Vedas and the Adhyātma Tradition", *Indian Culture* 5 (1938/39), p. 285 ff.
- , "One hundred and one names of Prāṇa in Vedic literature", *ibid.*, p. 387 ff.
- AL-GEORGE, SERGIU and ARION ROȘU, "Indriya et le sacrifice des prāṇa", *M.I.O.* 5 (1957), p. 346-397.
- BODEWITZ, H. W., "Der Vers *vicaṣaṇād rtavo* . . (JB. 1, 18; 1, 50; KauṣU. 1, 2)", *Z.D.M.G. Supplementa* I, 3 (Vorträge XVII. Deutscher Orientalistentag in Würzburg) (1969), SS. 843-848.
- BUITENEN, J. A. B. VAN, see MaiU.
- BURNELL, A. C., *A Legend from the Talavakāra or Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda*. Mangalore 1878. Repr. in *Atti IV Congresso Intern. d. Orientalisti*, II (Florence 1881), p. 97 ff. and *Indian Antiquary* 13 (1884), p. 16 ff.
- CALAND, W., *Das Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa in Auswahl. Text, Übersetzung, Indices*. Amsterdam Academy 1919.
- , "Emendationen zum Jaiminiya-brāhmaṇa", *W.Z.K.M.* 28 (1914), SS. 61-77.
- , "Over en uit het Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa", *Versl. Meded. Kon. Akad. v. Wetensch., Afd. Letterk. Vijfde Reeks* I (Amsterdam 1915), p. 1-106.
- , *Die altindischen Todten- und Bestattungsgebräuche*. Amsterdam Academy 1896.
- , *The Pitrmedhasūtras of Baudhāyana, Hiranyakeśin, Gautama*. Leipzig (Abh. K.M. 10/3) 1896.
- , *Altindischer Ahnencult. Das Śrāddha nach den verschiedenen Schulen mit Benützung handschriftlicher Quellen dargestellt*. Leiden 1893.
- COOMARASWAMY, A. K., "Ātmayajña: Self-Sacrifice", *H.J.A.S.* 6, p. 358 ff.
- , "Prāṇa-citi", *J.R.A.S.* 1943, p. 105 ff.
- DELBRÜCK, B., *Altindische Syntax*. Halle 1888.
- DEUSSEN, P., *Sechzig Upanishad's des Veda aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt und mit Einleitungen und Anmerkungen versehen*. Leipzig 1897.
- , *The Philosophy of the Upanishads* (tr. by A. S. Geden). Edinburgh 1906.
- DUMONT, P.-E., *L'Agnihotra. Description de l'agnihotra dans le rituel védique d'après les Śrutasūtras*. Baltimore 1939.

- , "Taittirīya Brāhmaṇa 1.4.3-4", *Mélanges d'Indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou* (Paris 1968), p. 243 ff.
- DUTT, MANMATHA NATH, *The Dharma Śāstra or Hindu Law Codes (English Translation)*. Calcutta 1908 (2 vols.).
- ELIADE, M., *Le Yoga. Immortalité et Liberté*. Paris 1960.
- , "Cosmical homology and Yoga", *J.I.S.O.A.* 5 (1937), p. 188-203.
- FRAUWALLNER, E., *Geschichte der indischen Philosophie*, I. Salzburg 1953.
- FRENZ, A., *Über die Verben im Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa*. Thesis Marburg 1966.
- , see KauṣU.
- GAMPERT, W., *Die Sühnezeremonien in der altindischen Rechtsliteratur*. Prag 1939.
- GELDNER, K. F., *Vedismus und Brahmanismus (Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch)*. Tübingen 1928^a.
- GHOSH, B., *Collection of the Fragments of Lost Brāhmaṇas*. Calcutta 1935.
- GONDA, J., *Die Religionen Indiens*, I. Stuttgart 1960.
- , *Viṣṇuism and Śaivism. A Comparison [Jordan Lectures 1969]*. London 1970.
- , *The Savayajñas (Kauśikasūtra 60-68. Translation, Introduction, Commentary)*. Amsterdam Academy 1965.
- , *Loka. World and Heaven in the Veda*. Amsterdam Academy 1966.
- GOUDRIAAN, T., "Vaikhānasa Daily Worship. According to the handbooks of Atri, Bhṛgu, Kāśyapa, and Marīci", *I.I.J.* 12 (1970), p. 161-215.
- HARTMANN, H., *Der Totenkult in Irland*. Heidelberg 1952.
- HEESTERMAN, J. C., *The Ancient Indian Royal Consecration* (thesis Utrecht). The Hague 1957.
- , "Brahmin, Ritual and Renouncer", *W.Z.K.S.O.* 8 (1964), p. 1-31.
- HERTEL, J., *Die Weisheit der Upanischaden. Eine Auswahl aus den ältesten Texten. Aus dem Sanskrit übersetzt und erläutert*. München 1922^a [especially p. 148 ff. containing a translation of JB. 1, 17-18; 49-50].
- HOENS, D. J., *Śānti. A Contribution to Ancient Indian Religious Terminology*. Thesis Utrecht 1951.
- HOFFMANN, K., "Textkritisches zum Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa", *I.I.J.* 4 (1960), p. 1-36.
- , "Die Weltentstehung nach dem Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa", *M.S.S.* 27, SS. 59-67.
- , *Der Injunktiv im Veda. Eine synchronische Funktionsuntersuchung*. Heidelberg 1967.
- HORSCH, P., *Die Vedische Gāthā- und Śloka-Literatur*. Bern 1966.
- HUME, R. E., *The Thirteen Principal Upanishads translated from the Sanskrit*. Oxford 1931^a.
- KANE, P. V., *History of Dharmaśāstra*, II & IV. Poona 1941-53.
- KEITH, A. B., *Religion and Philosophy of the Veda and Upanishads*. H.O.S. 31-32. 1925.
- , *Rigveda Brahmanas: The Aitareya and Kauṣītaki brāhmaṇas of the Rigveda translated from the original Sanskrit*. H.O.S. 25. 1920.
- LÉVI, S., *La doctrine du sacrifice dans les Brāhmaṇas*. Paris 1898 (repr. Paris 1966).
- LOKESH CHANDRA, *The Jaiminiya-Brāhmaṇa of the Sāmaveda. II. 1-80 (Gavāmayana) critically edited for the first time*. S.V.S. 21 (thesis Utrecht). 1950.
- LOKESH CHANDRA & RAGHU VIRA, "Studies in the Jaiminiya Brāhmaṇa (Book I)", *Fs. Kirfel* (Bonn 1955), SS. 255-276 [= *A.O.* 22, p. 55-74].
- , see JB.

- LOMMEL, H., "Bhṛgu im Jenseits", *Paideuma* 4 (1950), SS. 93-109.
- LÜDERS, H., *Varuṇa: I. Varuṇa und die Wasser; II. Varuṇa und das Rta*. Edited by L. Alsdorf. Göttingen 1951-59.
- MACDONELL, A. A., *A Vedic Grammar for Students*. Oxford 1916.
- MAYRHOFER, M., *Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen [A Concise Etymological Sanskrit Dictionary]*. Heidelberg 1956—.
- MINARD, A., *Trois Énigmes sur les Cent Chemins. Recherches sur le Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. I-II*. Paris 1949-56.
- M.-W. = M. MONIER-WILLIAMS, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford 1899².
- NARTEN, JOHANNA, "Das Vedische Verbum math", *I.I.J.* 4, p. 121-135.
- NEGELEIN, J. VON, see AthPr.
- OERTEL, H., "Contributions from the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa", *Trans. Conn. Acad. A. & Sc.* 15 (1909), p. 155-216 [this paper contains a survey of Oertel's publications on JB. in *J.A.O.S.*; the introductions to the sections of my translation refer to these papers].
- , *Roots and Verb-Forms from the Unpublished Parts of the Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇa*. Pp. 1-115. Published in *J.V.S.* 1 (1934), p. 129-168; 2 (1935), p. 121-195.
- , *The Syntax of Cases in the Narrative and Descriptive Prose of the Brāhmaṇas. I. The Disjunct Use of Cases*. Heidelberg 1926.
- OLDENBERG, H., *Die Religion des Veda*. Berlin 1923².
- Petr. Dict.* = O. BÖHTLINGK & R. ROTH, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch* (7 vols.). Petrograd 1852-75.
- Pratidānam. Indian, Iranian and Indo-European Studies presented to F. B. J. Kuiper on his sixtieth birthday*. The Hague 1968.
- RAGHU VIRA, see LOKESH CHANDRA.
- , see JB.
- RANGACHARI, DIWAN BAHADUR K., "The Śrī Vaishnava Brahmins", *Bull. Madras Govt. Mus., N.S., General Section II*, 2 (1931).
- RAU, W., *Staat und Gesellschaft im alten Indien nach den Brāhmaṇa-Texten dargestellt*. Wiesbaden 1957.
- RENOU, L., see KauṣU.
- , *Index Védique*. Pp. 1-163. Published in *J.V.S.* 1, p. 196-208; 257-320; 2, p. 1-59.
- ROŞU, ARION, see AL-GEORGE, SERGIU.
- RUBEN, W., *Beginn der Philosophie in Indien*. Berlin 1956².
- SCHERMAN, L., *Materialien zur Geschichte der Indischen Visionsliteratur*. Leipzig 1892.
- SCHNEIDER, U., "Die altindische Lehre vom Kreislauf des Wassers", *Saeculum* 12 (1961), SS. 1-11.
- SCHRAPEL, D., *Untersuchung der Partikel iva und anderer lexikalisch-syntaktischer Probleme der vedischen Prosa nebst zahlreichen Textemendationen und der kritischen Übersetzung von Jaiminīya-Brāhmaṇa 2, 371-373 (Gavāmāyana I)*. Thesis Marburg 1970.
- SPEYER, J. S., *Vedische und Sanskrit-Syntax*. Strassburg 1896.
- Śrautakośa*. Ed. C. G. Kashikar, R. N. Dandekar a.o. Vol. I: *Sanskrit Section; English Section 1-2*. Poona 1958-63.
- STAAL, J. F., *Advaita and Neoplatonism. A Critical Study in Comparative Philosophy*. Madras 1961.
- THIEME, P., "Der Weg durch den Himmel nach der Kaushitaki-Upanischad", *Wiss. Zs. Univ. Halle-Wittenberg* 1, 3 (1951/52), SS. 19-36.
- VARENNE, J., see MNU.

- VEDA VYASA, *Jaiminīya Brāhmaṇam* [specimen pages]. Lahore (D.A.V. College) 1928.
- WACKERNAGEL, J. (A. DEBRUNNER; L. RENOU), *Altindische Grammatik. I-III*. Göttingen 1896-1957. Register by R. Hauschild, Göttingen 1957.
- WEBER, A., "Ueber die Metrik der Inder", *I.S.* 8 (1863), SS. 39 ff.
- , "Eine Legende des Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa über die strafende Vergeltung nach dem Tode", *Z.D.M.G.* 9, SS. 237 ff.
- WINDISCH, E., "Zu Kauṣitakibrāhmaṇa Upaniṣad I, 2", *Berichte K.S.G.d.W.* 59 (1907), SS. 111 ff.
- , *Buddha's Geburt und die Lehre von der Seelenwanderung*. Leipzig (*Abh. K.S.G.d.W.* 26/2), 1908.
- WOODROFFE, SIR JOHN, *Introduction to Tantra Shastra*. Madras 1952².

GENERAL INDEX

- Agni: death 46, n. 1; 85, n. 2; death subdued by oblations 45 f.
- Agnicayana 276 ff.; 281 f.; 290, n. 62; agreements with prāṇāgni-hotra 279
- Agni-hotra: its meaning 1 f.; a reduced great sacrifice 24 ff.; equated with Soma sacrifices 24 ff.; 27, n. 6; 80; 84; 92; 217; sacred to all the gods (*vaiśvadeva-*) 30; 34, n. 20; 66 ff.; sacred to Prajāpati 30; 34, n. 19; frees from evil 36, 38 f.; 50; subdues death 45 f.; places the performer in heaven 42 f.; produces a place in heaven 52 ff.; re-integrates the sun 35 f.; produces impregnation and delivery of the sun-child 35; is breath(ing) 64; 238; 240; is life and maintains life 222; 225 f.; 332, n. 16; is offered in the *prāṇa* 19 f.; 229, n. 27; is unlimited 28, n. 19; its oblation is food 20; 23, n. 14; 230; its oblation and the substitutes 63; 230 ff.; its performance during a journey (*pravāsa*) 63 f.; during twelve days after the *agnyādhāna* 80 ff.; its *grhya* version 215; its description in non-Yajurvedic texts 9 f.; the isolated position of its JB. description within the Jaiminiya texts 10; *see also* Sun; Truth
- Agnyādhāna 19 f.; 220; 225; 228, n. 11; 320; is the birth of the sacrificer 21, n. 3; 229, n. 20
- Alternation: aspect of the agni-hotra missing in the prāṇāgni-hotra 218; 241; 267; 319
- Anonymity of the soul 60, n. 30
- Anuṣṭubh 87 ff.
- Aorist 76, n. 10
- Asceticism 324; 333, n. 46; *see also* Prāṇāgni-hotra (its performers)
- Barku Vārṣṇa (Vārṣṇi) 74 f.
- Bhojana (meal) 228, n. 14; 242, n. 22; 318
- Bhṛgu 99 ff.
- Brahmin's meal: sacrifice of the host 223; 227, n. 14; 303
- Breathing: an agni-hotra 238; 240
- Breaths *see* Fires
- Breath-speech sacrifice 239 f.; 242, n. 18
- Central conceptions ("Zentralbe-griffe") 117, n. 3; 122, n. 28
- Chronology (relative): of JB. I, 1-65 (agni-hotra) 9-13; of the related agni-hotra sections 13; AB. 153; 194; AB.-TB. 151; 163; ĀgnGS. 138 f.; ĀpSS.-HirSS. 153; 184; ĀsvGS.-SSS. 135; ĀsvSS.-ĀpSS. 195; AthPr. 154; BĀU.-ChU. 286, n. 31, 33; BPiS.-BhārPiS. 135 ff.; BSS. 153; 154; DSS. 134 f.; HirSS. 173; JGS. 126 f.; LSS.-JB. 134; MS.-KS. 160; 162 f.; MSS. 139; 154; ŚB. 202; TU.-MaiU. 281; 291, n. 63; ŚB.-LSS.-SSS.-ĀsvGS.-KauS.-BPiS. 131 ff.
- Churning fire (*manthana*) 19 ff.
- Circumambulation 147, n. 26
- Completeness 167; 169
- Contactus 145 f.; 161
- Contest of the *prāṇāh* 220; 226, n. 1; 269 ff.; 274; 333, n. 44
- Corpse: an oblation 115; 144 f.
- Cosmic perspective of sacrifice 169
- Cosmic sacrifice in śrāddha bhojana 260 f.
- Cosmification 266 f.; 320; 332, n. 24; 334, n. 56
- Cosmogony 33, n. 13; 40, n. 8
- Cremation 124 ff.; 140 f.; its relation to agnyādhāna and agni-hotra 19 f.; 225; 229, n. 21; 320
- Discussions: between texts (stock pattern) 197, n. 2; between persons (*brahmodya*) 62 ff.; 72 ff.; 216; 222 f.; 236; 320; the tactics of the debate 77, n. 11
- Eating and being eaten in return 84 f., n. 1; 100 ff.; 107, n. 16
- Eating food: regarded as an agni-hotra, but neither being a prāṇāgni-hotra nor replacing the actual rite 219, n. 10; 243 ff.; 253, n. 16
- Element added to a totality 87 ff.
- Embryology 53 f.; 55 f.
- Eschatology 13 f.; 54 f.; 110 ff.
- Esoteric doctrines (practices) *see* Expiations
- "Etmologies" 81; 86, n. 21; 121, n. 19; 160; 272; 285, n. 28
- Evil 38 f.; 39, n. 7; 50; 100 f.
- Exchange between heaven and earth 219, n. 9; 245; 247
- Expiations 2; 100 f.; 150 ff.; 163 f.; connected with *adhyātmam* interpretations 221 f.; with esoteric doctrines 222 ff.; 236 f.; 320; 332, n. 21
- Fires: *prāṇāh* (breaths or vital powers) 20 f.; 142, n. 3; 198, n. 11; 220 ff.; three *prāṇāh* 22, n. 11; 227, n. 6; object rather than instrument of worship 221; 225; abandoned or retained by prāṇāgni-hotrin? 233 f.; 305; 311; *see also* Transfer of the fires
- Five fires (doctrine of the) 110 ff.; *see also* Pañcāgnividyā
- Food 23, n. 14; 230; 233, n. 1; 271 f.
- Funeral rites 2; 14; 124 ff.; *see also* Cremation; Obsolete customs; Piling of the implements; Transfer of the fires
- Gold: immortality 23, n. 21; 109, n. 26; replaces fire 178 f.; replaces sun 201
- Hammer in sun and death cult 118
- Hell 100 ff.
- Homology: macro- and microcosmic 287 f.; 289, n. 52; of fire, *prāṇa* and sun 276 ff.; 279; 281; 283; 290, n. 62; of *prāṇa* and sun 276
- Indra: sun 37, n. 12
- Initial position of predicate 105, n. 6
- Initial words 120
- Injunctive 44, n. 7; 53; 59, n. 23; 122, n. 26
- Interiorization 317, n. 18; 319; 323; 328 ff.; 334, n. 55
- Karman beside prāyaścitti 159; 188
- Killing of the victim in funeral rites 147 f.
- Knowledge of its implications replacing the actual rite 240 f.
- Kṣatriyas 72; 77, n. 11; 215 ff.; 237; 243 f.; 252, n. 4; 319
- Maruts 89, n. 28
- Meditation 289, n. 51, 56; 336, n. 75; 337, n. 76
- Mental (symbolic) agnicayana 282; 292, n. 65; 322
- Mental agni-hotra 64; 65, n. 9; 231; 237 f.; 239; 242, n. 10
- Mental sacrifices 230 f.; 257 f.; 293 ff., 301; 318; 320 f.; 332, n. 27; 340, n. 1
- Mental pūjā 317, n. 18
- Metres in classifications 87 ff.
- Middle voice 157, n. 17
- Mitra establishing contacts 174
- Night and day: Śyāma and Śabala 29 ff.; two oceans 32, n. 4; recurring death 47, n. 7; on this side of the sun 42; destructive time 43, n. 6; the *pratimāh* of the year 33, n. 13
- Numeral symbolism 87, n. 26
- Obsolete customs in funeral rites 125 f.; 144, n. 11; 147, n. 25
- Optative 146, n. 18; 156, n. 8
- Oral tradition 143, n. 9
- Pañcāgnividyā 110 ff.; 216; 248 ff.; 269; 322
- Pendent nominative 106, n. 12
- Piling of the implements (*pātracayana*) 131 ff.
- Plural indicative and singular optative 146, n. 18
- Pluti 26, n. 2; 176, n. 3
- Prajāpati: the sun 36; all the gods or the All-gods 30
- Prāṇa: cosmic and microcosmic 218; 222 f.; 227, n. 12; 271 f.; 276; 278; 284, n. 20, 25, 26; 285, n. 29; clothed in water 284, n. 25
- Prāṇāgni-hotra 2; 23, n. 15 f.; 27, n. 8; 37, n. 13; 49, n. 17; 217; 220; 264, n. 20; 275 ff.; its starting-points 13; 223-26; 232 f.; 237; 333, n. 42; its performers 213; 293 ff.; 313; its agreements with the agni-hotra 232; 334, n. 54
- Rebirth 100; *see also* Transmigration; in the son 52; 55 f.; 246
- Retribution in yonder world 100
- Reversal in yonder world 100 ff.; of *agens* and *patiens* 107, n. 16
- Sāmans 10; 98, n. 28; 139
- Savitṛ: Prajāpati 30; 33, n. 16; the

- light before sunrise 30; 33, n. 15
 ŚB.: different layers 89, n. 26; 221;
 227, n. 7, 11
 Silence 232; 310
 Sin *see* Evil
 Singular optative and plural indica-
 tive 146
 Sipping water (*āpośāna*) 256 f.; 270;
 311
 Snake skin (simile of the) 39, n. 6
 Soul (concept of the) 57 f.
 Śrāddha bhojana 259 ff.; 321; 333, n.
 36
 Śrīnivāsa (author of Subodhinī) 125
 Subodhinī (comm. on JGS.) 125; 127;
 130
 Sun: Prajāpati 36; Indra 37, n. 12,
 13; prāṇa 37, n. 11, 13 (*see also*
 Homology); demarcation between
 death and immortality 42; identic-
 al with the agnihotrin 52 ff.; is
 offered (or offers itself) in Agni and
 conversely 38; 39, n. 2; 72 ff.; 235;
 240 (*see also* Agnihotra); its course
 during the night 202
 Third *savana* is "sucked out" 27, n.
 15
 Thirteenth month 59 f.; 122, n. 27
 Time of the agnihotra performance
 29 ff.
 Transfer of the fires before death 142,
 n. 3; 228, n. 19; 229, n. 26
 Transmigration 113; 216; 244; 246;
 248; *see also* Rebirth
 Transmission of texts rather than
 rituals 131; 203
 Truth: water and dikṣā 27, n. 9;
 sacrifice (doctrine) 78, n. 17; 223;
 234, n. 7; 235 ff.; 241, n. 6
 Varuṇa, Bhṛgu's father 105, n. 1
 Viśve Devas 87 ff.; 97, n. 23
 Water: truth 27, n. 9; immortality
 117, n. 3; its function in expiations
 163 f.
 Water doctrine ("Wasserlehre") 22,
 n. 6; 113 f.; 216 f.; 243 ff.; 252, n.
 4; 290, n. 59
 Year: father of man 60, n. 25; 122, n.
 26; 218; immortality 118, n. 11;
 based on night and day 33, n. 13

INDEX OF SANSKRIT TERMS

- a- (privative) 107 f.
agnicayana- *see* Agnicayana
agnyādhāna- *see* Agnyādhāna
atly- 273
atsyanti- (Death) 86, n. 16
adas- 160; 181, n. 1; 186, n. 7; 205,
 n. 4
adhi + loc./abl. 199, n. 15
adhikakṣya- 91, n. 43
adhyātmam 19; 21, n. 1; 215; 218;
 226; 229, n. 28; 230; 235 ff.; 258,
 n. 8; 304; 319
anakāmamāra- 23, n. 15
anuṣṭubh- *see* Anuṣṭubh
anuṣṭubhā 37, n. 9; 166, n. 4
anta-
āntād 88
antaram agnihotram 239; 265
anna- (*see also* Food) 271 ff.
annasūkta- 341, n. 9
anya- 105, n. 2
anyajanāḥ 97 f.
anvāyatta- 88
anvārabdha- 145 f.
apasalam, -salī(m) 147, n. 26
abhirotātram 195; 199 f.
abhi- 86, n. 21
ama- 257, n. 3
arka- 78, n. 20
arkāśvamedhau 78, n. 20
arj-
ati- 123, n. 31
pra- 90, n. 38
ardhamāsam
ardhamāśya- 59, n. 21
avarti- 186, n. 2
avasa- 90, n. 38
aśvamedha- 78, n. 20
asu- (= *prāṇa*) 57, n. 14
ahuta- 176, n. 5
ahorātre/ahorātrau 34, n. 23
ākāśa- 56, n. 5
ātmayajña- 19; 23, n. 13; 226; 227, n.
 14; 277; 289, n. 51; 301 f.; 304 f.;
 319; 331, n. 13; 335, n. 63
ātmayāga- 312 f.
ātmayājñin- 23, n. 13; 303 ff.; 309, n.
 45 f.; 330; 337, n. 85
ātmejjyāna- 304
ādhānapratihita- (?) 91, n. 41
ādhipatya- 275; 287, n. 39
ānati- 48, n. 14
āpośāna- *see* Sipping water
ās-
upa- 79, n. 22; 253, n. 24
itarajanāḥ 97 f.
iti 74, n. 1; 95, n. 1
iti- 78 f.
idam-
ayam- (deictic) 143, n. 9
idaṃ sarvam 166 ff.
id u 176, n. 3
indriya- 324
iyattā- 57, n. 12
iva 77 f.; 170, n. 12; 198, n. 9
iśyā- 117, n. 8
udāna- 227, n. 5
uddruta- 170, n. 10
upanati- 48, n. 14
upamāsa- 59 f.
upamrṣṭa- 27, n. 14
upasanna- 70, n. 4
upasṛṣṭa 69, n. 1; 170, n. 10
upāsana- 79, n. 22
ubhayatorātram 195; 199 f.
ubhayāpadin- 43, n. 2
uh- 176, n. 4
ūrj- 36, n. 3; 86, n. 17
ūh- 176, n. 4
ekavīra-
(eko vīraḥ) 37, n. 11
ej- 157, n. 13
etad 129; 258, n. 28
evamvid (evam vidvān) 106 f.; 253, n.
 25
evammukham 30; 34, n. 21
kathā- 75, n. 2
kāma- 77, n. 15
kāvya- 65, n. 7
kim
kim vidvān 119, n. 15
kim vid 65, n. 6
kūṭa- 118, n. 14; 147 f.
kram-
apa- 186, n. 5
vyut- 189 f.

- khyā-*
prati- 182
gati- 78 f.
gad- 186, n. 8
gā-
upa- 63
gāyatri
 (in *prāṇāgnihoṭra*) 316, n. 15; 317, n. 20, 26; 341, n. 10
guṇ-
jugups- 55, n. 4
grhāḥ 97, n. 19
graha- 97, n. 19
car- + gerund 198, n. 3
ci-
pratyapa- 84 f.
chādimuṣṭi- 157, n. 14
jan-
upa- 59, n. 24
-janāḥ 97 f.
jarāmartya- 156, n. 2
jarāmarya- 155 f.
jarāmūrīya- 155 f.
ji-
jigīṣ- 46, n. 2
juhvāsyā- 209, n. 7
jyēṣṭhagrhya- 157, n. 18
tata- 103, n. 14; 123, n. 34
tad (adv.) 159
tad eva 180
tad yathā 120
tad yad 120
tan-
tata- 86, n. 10
tūṣṇim
 + *ās-*, *sthā-* 107, n. 18
 (see also Silence)
dīrghasattra- 155, n. 1
deva- ("brahmin") 77, n. 16
devāḥ ("vital powers") 20; 22, n. 12; 23, n. 13; 324
devajanāḥ 97 f.
devayājim- 23, n. 13; 304; 330; 337, n. 85
devayāna- 113 f.; 121, n. 22; 248; 250 f.
dyumna- 32 f.
dhām- 40, n. 8
dhāman-
priyaṃ dhāma 46 f.
dhāv- 186 f.
dhū-/dhū- 121, n. 20
na 89, n. 30
nam-
ā-/upa- 48, n. 14
nard-
 (anu)ni- 22, n. 5
naś- 191, n. 1
niṣkṛti- 152
naivedya- 261; 264, n. 20
nyaṅga- 40 f.
nu eva 176, n. 3
pac- 170, n. 11
pañcāgnividyā see *Pañcāgnividyā*
pad-
ā 175, n. 1
paramāsa- (?) 157, n. 17
parastād 207
parokṣam/parokṣena 121, n. 21
palāy- 61, n. 31
pātracayana- see Piling of the implements
pāpa- 39 f.
pāpivāc- 49, n. 18
pāpman- (in apposition) 40 f.; 185, n. 1
 (adj.) 41
pitryāna- 113 f.; 121, n. 22; 216; 248; 250; 253, n. 22
pitryāvat- 59, n. 22
purīṣa- 144, n. 11
pūjā- 261; 264, n. 20; 316, n. 18; 328 f.
pṛ-
abhyut- 147, n. 23
prakāśa + *iva* 77 f.
prakāśavat- 142, n. 2
prakrānta- 69 f.; 170, n. 10
prajāti- 166, n. 6
pratimukham 71, n. 6
pratīveśa- 178
pratiṣṭhā- (dual) 138
pratta- 64, n. 2
pratyāśa- 84 f.
prayata 48, n. 12; 172; 176, n. 9
prayati- 48, n. 12
pravāsa (*agnihotra*) 65, n. 9; 231; 237 f.; 321
pravṛtta- (?) 86, n. 11
prasuta- 59, n. 20
prāṇa- 21, n. 2; 47, n. 9; 220
 (= *asu-*) 57, n. 14
 (announcing man's karma) 57, n. 13
 (in embryology) 55 f.
 (plural) 20, n. 1; 220; 226, n. 1-2; 266

- (see also *Prāṇa* and *Fires*)
prāṇāgnihoṭra- see *Prāṇāgnihoṭra*
prāṇāhuti- 318; 331, n. 2, 3
prāṇodānau 186, n. 3
prāyaścitti- see Expiations
preta- 48, n. 12; 172; 176, n. 9
preti- 48, n. 12
bali- 270
brahmodya- see Discussions
brū-
pra- 58, n. 17; 75, n. 4
bhaj- 341, n. 3
bhasman- 21 f.
bhū-
upapra- 166, n. 5
bhūta- (= *subhūta-*) 95, n. 2
bhūtakṛt- 95, n. 2
bhṛ-
sa- 26 f.
bhojana- see *Bhojana*
bhojanavidhi- 256; 310
math-/manth- 43 f.
abhivi- 198, n. 5
madhuparka- 257; 258, n. 11; 321
manas-
 (in classifications) 22, n. 6
mantray-
anu-, upa- 205, n. 5
mantha- 273 ff.; 333, n. 44
manthana- see Churning fire
martyavat- (?) 51, n. 3
mahat- 286, n. 32
mānasa- 231; 295 f.; 306, n. 3, 12
mukhataḥ 34, n. 22
mṛj-
upa- 27, n. 14
mṛtyuvanta- 229, n. 21
methi- 64, n. 4
mruc-
vi- 36, n. 2
yaj- + loc. 289, n. 51
yatra . . . *tad* 159 f.
yathā 148, n. 32
yad 57, n. 7
yadā 51, n. 4; 141, n. 1
yāyāvara- 289 f.; 311; 313; 317, n. 22; 333 f.
yāvajjivānāśakavratin- 85, n. 5
yukta- 156, n. 5
yuktam (adv.) 157, n. 9
yoni- 42, n. 1
rabh-
anvā- 145 f.
rasa- 36, n. 3
rād- 77, n. 16
ripa- 86, n. 9
rudh- (fut. *rotsyati*) 157 f.
pra- 119, n. 15; 198, n. 11
labh-
upa- 170, n. 12
loka-
 (*asau/paro lokah*) 105, n. 4
vaṃśa- 97, n. 17
vaṃśanartin- 97, n. 17
vad- 178
ati- 76 f.
 (anu)saṃ- 75 f.
vāc- 49, n. 18; 112
vicakṣaṇa- 58, n. 19
vid-
saṃ-/prati- 60, n. 26
vibhāt- 33, n. 13
viśve devāḥ 34, n. 17
 see also *Viśve Devas*
vīti- 209, n. 9
vṛj-
pra- 119, n. 15; 198 f.
vṛt- 56, n. 5
ā- (intens.) 31, n. 3
vyā- + abl./instr. 209, n. 3
vedaśarīra- 24 f.
vai 197, n. 2
vaiśvānara- 116 f.
vaiśava (?) 32, n. 8
vyāvṛtti- 51, n. 1
vraśc-
ava-/saṃ- 197 f.
śarīrayajña- 231; 255; 308, n. 38
śālīna- 298 f.; 311
śukra- 176 f.
śraddhā- 117, n. 3; 239; 242, n. 15
śri-
adhi- 95, n. 3
śoḍaśakala- 85 f.
sa (expletive) 119 ff.
sa yathā 119 ff.
sa yad — *tad yad* 220
saṃstaraṇi- 125
sakṛt
 (*idaṃ sakṛt sarvaṃ*) 85 f.
saṃkramaṇa- 32, n. 8
satānu- 37, n. 10
satyavāda- 223; 234, n. 7; 237; 246
 (see also *Truth*)
satyavādin- 78, n. 17; 240 f.
sabhāga- 76, n. 8

samāvantartana- 228, n. 14; 302 f.; 308,
n. 32; 323
samunmukha- 71, n. 6
samyddha- 280 f.; 289, n. 58
sambhṛta- 26 f.
sarpadevajanañh 98, n. 23
sarpetarajanañh 98, n. 23
sarva-
 iđam sarvam 28, n. 18; 166 ff.
sarvaprāyaścitti- 166, n. 7
salokatā 253, n. 25
saviṃśa- 86, n. 20
sāṅga- 37, n. 10
sādhu kṛ- 57, n. 9
sāyujya- 253, n. 25
sāvasa 90, n. 38
sic-
 parā- 176, n. 11
su- 59, n. 20
 pra- 59, n. 20
sukṭtarasa- 61, n. 35
subhūtakṛt- 95, n. 2
subhūmi- 141 f.

INDEX OF SANSKRIT TEXT-PLACES

A SELECTION

AA.		4, 3	161 f.	6, 1, 5	27, n. 8
2, 1, 4	41	5, 1	202 f.	6, 1, 6	27, n. 16
5, 3, 3	75	5, 4	207	6, 1, 7	27, n. 8
AB.		AV.		6, 10, 4	95, n. 2
2, 34, 6	229, n. 27	10, 4, 1	70	6, 10, 12	95, n. 2
4, 24, 14 f.	59	BAU.		9, 3, 12	178
5, 26, 6-8	66 ff.	4, 3, 1	77	9, 9, 3	152; 153 f.
5, 31, 3	229, n. 27	6, 1	269 ff.	9, 12, 9	194 f.
7, 2, 2	180	6, 1, 14	256 f; 270	9, 14, 4 ff.	154
7, 3	184	6, 1-2	251	BhG.	
7, 5, 2	160 f.	6, 2	243	4, 24 ff.	335, n. 58
7, 12, 1 f.	202	6, 2, 2,	113	BPIS.	
7, 12, 3	152 f.	6, 2, 9 ff.	110 ff.	1, 4	148, n. 27
7, 12, 5	230	6, 2, 13	114	1, 5 f.	131 ff.
ÄgnGs.		6, 2, 14	114	1, 6	146 f., n. 22
2, 4, 10	261	6, 3	273 ff.	BrahmPr.	
3, 4, 2	138 f.	6, 3, 2	286, n. 33	41 ^b	161
AgnPr.		BDhS.		BSS.	
8 ^b	161	2, 7, 12	298 f.; 323	3, 6	71, n. 6
12 ^b	203	2, 7, 12, 1	311	27, 5	152 f.
ÄpSS.		2, 7, 12, 2	231 f.	29, 5	231 f.; 321
5, 23, 3	90	2, 7, 12, 3	49, n. 17	ChU.	
6, 4, 7	31	2, 7, 12, 4	232	5	250
6, 5, 6	95	2, 7, 12, 10	257, n. 5	5, 1-2	269 ff.; 275
6, 6, 10	95	2, 7, 12, 12 f.	259	5, 1, 12	120 f.
6, 9, 4	97	2, 7, 12, 12-14	315, n. 4	5, 2, 2	256 f.
6, 12, 4	98	2, 7, 12, 13 f.	256	5, 2, 4 ff.	273 ff.
9, 5, 5	189	2, 7, 13, 9	233 f., n. 6	5, 3 ff.	243
9, 6, 1	170	2, 10, 18, 8 f.	299 f.	5, 3, 3	113
9, 9, 1	195	BGS.		5, 3, 6	76, n. 8
9, 11, 20	180	2, 11, 38	258, n. 9; 259	5, 3, 7	76, n. 10
12, 18, 17	31	BhâgP.		5, 4 ff.	110 ff.
16, 16, 1	85	8, 7, 4	107, n. 18	5, 9, 1	114
31, 2, 21	138	BhârParS.		5, 10, 3	253, n. 24
ÄsvGS.		185	228, n. 11	5, 18, 2	283, n. 7
4, 3, 2 ff.	131 ff.	BhârPiS.		5, 19 ff.	265 ff.
4, 4, 2	148	1, 1, 4	141, n. 2	5, 19, 1	271
ÄsvSS.		1, 1, 18	145, n. 15	5, 23, 2	283, n. 5
2, 2, 15	95	1, 5, 1	148, n. 27	DSS.	
2, 4, 13	98	1, 6, 15	138	23, 4, 16 ff.	131 ff.; 134
AthPr.		1, 6, 19	137	GB.	
1, 2	203	2, 10, 7	145, n. 15	1, 3, 12	98, n. 23
1, 3 f.	154	BhârSS.		1, 3, 13 f.	224
2, 4	182			1, 3, 14	265 ff.
2, 7	207				

GobhGS.	1, 287	286, n. 32
4, 6, I	23, n. 15	1, 294
GPIs.	1, 329	64, n. 3; 70, n. 5
2, 7, 12 ff.	131 ff.; 134	1, 345
2, 7, 26	134 f.	2, 6
Grhya-samgraha	2, 18	55 f.
2, 67	219	2, 136
HirGS.	2, 160	102; 105, n. 3; n. 4
2, 11, 5-12, I	259	3, 115
HirSS.	3, 115	165, n. 2
3, 7, 38	95, n. 2	3, 146
15, 3, 25	152 ff.	3, 303
HPIS.	3, 358	36, n. 3
I, I	141, n. 2	3, 359
JB.	3, 360	43, n. 5
I, I	221	3, 360
I, I-2	225 f.	3, 361
I, 2	146, n. 17; 230	3, 370
I, 6	47, n. 7	3, 377
I, 8	34; 38	43, n. 4
I, 9-10	50	JGS.
I, 13	34, n. 23	2, 4
I, 16	57, n. 13	124 ff.
I, 17-18	218	JSS.
I, 18	110 ff.; 114;	22 (23)
122, n. 27; 247 f.	236	98, n. 28
I, 19	237 f.	JUB.
I, 19-20	237 f.	1, 2, I, 12
I, 23	39, n. 2	26, n. 2
I, 41	120	3, 3, 3, 5
I, 45	248 f.; 253, n. 20	70, n. 5
I, 46	52 f.; 58, n. 15;	3, 3, 4, I ff.
248	248	52; 114
I, 47	19	3, 3, 4, I-6
I, 49	57, n. 14; 58, n. 14; 248	60, n. 29
I, 49 f.	52 f.	3, 3, 4, 6
I, 50	53; 60, n. 24, 25, 28; 61, n. 36;	61, n. 35
247 ff.; 253, n. 20	26, n. 2	60, n. 30
I, 51	177, n. 13	3, 5, I, 7 ff.
I, 53	48, n. 12	60, n. 30
I, 56	119, n. 15	4, 6, I, 2
I, 61	177, n. 12, 13	75, n. 2
I, 120	87 f.	4, 6, I, 4
I, 127	21, n. 4	43, n. 2
I, 133	51, n. I	4, 8, 4, 3
I, 248	74 f.	253, n. 22
I, 259	55, n. I	KauS.
I, 271	76, n. 8	81, 4 ff.

2, 19, 13	311 f.
LSS.	8, 8, 17 ff.
MaiU.	1, I
6, I ff.	322
6, 9	277; 288 f.
6, 10	289, n. 51
6, 11	277
6, 17	288, n. 46
6, 33	278; 281 f.; 291, n. 63; 322
6, 34	282 f.
6, 36 f.	280
6, 38	279 f.; 283
MärkP.	41, 8
317, n. 22	MBh.
12, 185, 5	309, n. 46
12, 236, 23 ff.	309, n. 46
MNU.	201-269
297	387 ff.
263, n. 11	473-478
260	505-517
295 f.	505-550
297	516
296	547
155 f.; 331, n. 7	MS.
I, 6, 4	21, n. 3
I, 8, 3	159
I, 8, 7	28, n. 19; 29;
32, n. 11; 201	I, 8, 8
194 f.	I, 8, 9
153	I, 8, 10
66 ff.	4, 2, 11
31, n. 1	MSS.
3, 3, I	195
3, 4, 9 f.	154
8, 19	139
8, 19, 17	148, n. 27
PB.	4, 9, 5
39, n. 6	8, I, 4
57, n. 11	9, 8, 8
39, n. 6	12, 6, 8
32, n. 11	17, 6, 3
40, n. 8	17, 6, 4
40, n. 8	19, 3, 3
59, n. 24	PrāpU.
17-19	255

33	255
PrapT.	6, 67
340, n. I	8, I ff.
340, n. I	8, 14 ff.
339 f.	Rām.
(Bombay ed.)	2, 63, 19
21 f.	(Crit. ed. II, p. 339
crit. app.)	RV.
10, 40, 13	70, n. 5
10, 72, 2	40, n. 8
10, 81, 3	40
ŚaṅvB.	2, 3, 10
76, n. 10	4, I, 3
24 f.	4, I, 5
24	4, I, 7-8
24	4, I, 16
24; 28, n. 18	4, 2
24	4, 2, I
28, n. 18	ŚaṅkhA.
10	265 ff.
11	273 f.
23, n. 15	11, 6
23, n. 15	ŚaṅkhB.
2, 8	240 f.
2, 9	29; 31, n. 3; 32,
n. 12	26, 4
70, n. 5	SB.
I, 2, 4, 3	41
I, 3, 3, 14	119, n. 15
168	2, 2, I, 4
21, n. 2	2, 2, 2, 14 f.
234, n. 7	2, 2, 2, 19
29	2, 3, I, 2 ff.
119, n. 15	3, 2, 4, 13
169	6, 6, 3, 3,
169	7, 2, 3, 3
46 f., n. 6	9, I, I, 22
169	9, 3, 4, 17
169	10, 2, I, 11
214	10, 2, 5, 16
236	10, 5, 3, I-12
62 ff.	11, 3, I, I ff.
237 f.	11, 3, I, I-8
65, n. 10	11, 3, I, 7

11, 3, I, 7 f.	242, n. 12
11, 5, 3, 7	98, n. 23
11, 5, 3, 8 ff.	222 f.
11, 6, I, I ff.	99 ff.
11, 6, 2, 2	39, n. 2
11, 6, 2, 6 ff.	111 f.
12, 3, 3, 5	26, n. 3
12, 4, I, I	26, n. 3
12, 4, I, I-5	152 ff.
12, 4, I, 3	156, n. 3
12, 4, I, 4	157, n. 17
12, 4, I, 6 ff.	159 ff.
12, 4, I, 7	177, n. 13
12, 4, I, 9-10	182 ff.
12, 4, I, 11	188 ff.
12, 4, 2, 2	172
12, 4, 2, 2-4	171 ff.
12, 4, 2, 5	180 f.
12, 4, 2, 6 ff.	159 ff.
12, 4, 2, 8	159 f.
12, 4, 2, 9-10	171 ff.
12, 4, 2, 10	166, n. 5
12, 4, 3, I	178 f.
12, 4, 3, 3	192 ff.;
196, n. 1; 197, n. 1, 2	207 ff.
12, 4, 3, 4 f.	119, n. 15
12, 4, 3, 6	192 ff.
12, 4, 3, 6-10	157 f.;
12, 4, 3, 8	199, n. 15
12, 4, 3, 10	200, n. 19
12, 4, 4, I	192 ff.
12, 4, 4, 2	177, n. 12;
12, 4, 4, 4	177, n. 12,
13	204 f., n. 2, 3
12, 4, 4, 6	201 ff.
12, 5, 2, 17	131 ff.
12, 8, 3, 31	48, n. 12
14, 6, 11, 2	121, n. 21
14, 9, I, 12 ff.	110 ff.
SivU.	4, 65 ff.
316, n. 18	SSS.
4, 14, 18 ff.	131 ff.
4, 14, 36	128 ff.
TĀ.	

6, I, 4	128 ff.
10, 64, I	155 f.
TB.	I, 2, I, 20
129	I, 4, 3, 4
160	I, 4, 3, 5
162	I, 4, 3, 6
153	I, 4, 4, I ff.
201 f.	I, 4, 4, 10
153	2, I, 2, 12
29	2, I, 6, I ff.
229, n. 27	3, 2, 10, 2
41	3, 4, 17, I
97, n. 17	3, 7, 2, 2
172 f.	3, 7, 6, 20
41	TS.
31, n. 3	3, 2, 2, I
214, n. 2	6, I, 4, 5
70, n. 5	7, 3, I, I
TU.	2, 2
291, n. 63	3, I
105, n. 2	VādhS.
229, n. 21	3, 4
185	3, 20
29 f.	3, 26
33, n. 13	3, 27
233, n. 3	3, 34
66 ff.	3, 37
VaiGS.	5, 4
138 f.	VaiSmS.
303	2, 17 f.
301 f.	2, 18
305	5, 8 f.
300 f.	10, 7
VaiSS.	20, 12 f.
202	VāsDhS.
227 f., n. 14	30, 2 f.
228, n. 14	30, 6-7
231	30, 8
VṛddhaHārta	Sm. 8, 91 f.
312	8, 98 ff.
312	8, 257 ff.
VS.	20, 13
47 f.	

CURRICULUM VITAE

Hendrik Wilhelm Bodewitz, geboren te Gramsbergen op 13 oktober 1939, bezocht van 1952 tot 1958 het Coevorder Lyceum. Na het eindexamen gymnasium A studeerde hij te Utrecht Klassieke en Indo-Iraanse Letteren. Het doctoraal examen werd afgelegd op 3 juni 1966. Na eerst aan het Instituut voor Oosterse Talen te Utrecht verbonden te zijn geweest als wetenschappelijk medewerker werkt hij thans (sinds 1 januari 1969) in dezelfde functie te Leiden (Instituut Kern) met als onderwijstaak Sanskrit.